School of Theology at Claremont
1001 1389953

The Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

Kritisch exegetisches Handbuch...
BS
2344
M5
1883
v.11

CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL

HANDBOOK

TO THE

REVELATION OF JOHN.

BY

FRIEDRICH DÜSTERDIECK, D.D.,
OBER-CONSISTORIALRATH, HANNOVER.

TRANSLATED FROM THE THIRD EDITION OF THE GERMAN, AND EDITED WITH NOTES,

BY

HENRY E. JACOBS, D.D.,
NORTON PROFESSOR OF SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY, EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, PHILADELPHIA, PENN.

NEW YORK:
FUNK & WAGNALLS, PUBLISHERS,
18 & 20 Astor Place.
1887.

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

COPYRIGHT, 1886,
BY FUNK & WAGNALLS.

PREFACE TO THE AMERICAN EDITION.

"BLESSED is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy." Such are the words in which this last book of the Bible is commended to our attention and study. However exalted its mysteries above our comprehension, we dare not because of their difficulty pass over them, but may confidently expect to be richly rewarded by the frequent contemplation even of those portions of the book whose solution we cannot even feebly conjecture in this life. It is perfectly consistent with the utmost simplicity in the preaching of the Gospel, and with the avoidance of curious speculations so much to be condemned, for the Christian pastor to aid the reading of his hearers by the exposition of such lines of divine thought in this book as in his private studies he can clearly trace.

This volume is offered as a help to such study. Its author, Dr. Fr. Düsterdieck, is well known as a writer on Apologetics, and still continues to publish exegetical papers in Luthardt's *Zeitschrift für kirchliche Wissenschaften* and elsewhere. He has furnished us with perhaps the most important commentary on this book which we thus far possess. His spirit is reverent and devout, his judgment generally calm and discriminating, his investigations wide and exhaustive. Although we concede so much, we are by no means ready to indorse his opinions on all the subjects presented, and in several of his long discussions we regard his judgment, which is ordinarily trustworthy, as seriously at fault. In revulsion from the assumptions of the Tübingen school, which conceded the apostolic origin of the Book of Revelation, and then from that basis endeavored to prove, because of dissimilarity of style, etc., the non-

Johannean origin of the Gospel ascribed to St. John, our author has taken the directly opposite position, and denied the apostolic origin of Revelation, — with what success, the reader must judge. Compelled in translation to examine the argument very closely, it has seemed to us at every step unsatisfactory, forced, and unworthy of the high character of this work. It must not be inferred, however, that, in denying that the Apostle John wrote the book, he also denies its inspiration: this he maintains, although with limitations which many of our readers will doubtless regret, as may be seen on pp. 84 sqq. The author belongs to the præterist class of interpreters, and argues that the time of composition was prior to the destruction of Jerusalem. In the notes, we have frequently given the arguments on an opposite side, mostly from some of the later standard authorities. This commentary is itself of high value, especially because of its compact summary of the interpretations of all the more prominent expositors, and in connection with what has been added, we are convinced, may be most safely and profitably employed.

The work of translation has often been extremely difficult, because of the long and involved sentences, frequently consisting of a mosaic of quotations; but we trust that the reader may be able, in the form which we have given, to follow the author intelligently.

HENRY E. JACOBS.

Theological Seminary of the Ev. Lutheran Church,
Philadelphia, Dec. 11, 1886.

EXEGETICAL LITERATURE.

THE various expositions of the Book of Revelation would, of themselves, form a library. This list includes the more prominent works, as well as some others of interest to students, either because of their recent or their American origin.

ALFORD: Greek Testament, vol. iv., 3d ed. 1866.

AUBERLEN: Der Prophet Daniel und die Offenbarung Johannis. 1854. English translation, 1856.

BARNES: Notes. 1852.

BECK: Erklärung d. Offenb. Joh. Cap. i.–xii., ed. Lindenmeyer, 1883.

BENGEL: Erklärte Off. Joh. 1740, 1834.
60 erbaul. Reden. 1748. 3d ed. 1835–37.

† BISPING: Erklärung der sieben katholischen Briefe. 1871.

BLEEK: Vorlesungen herausg. von Hossbach. 1862.

BOEHMER (E.): Verfasser u. Abfassungszeit der joh. Apoc. 1855.

BOEHMER (H.): Die Offenb. Joh. Ein neuer Versuch. 1865.

BRANDT (A. H. W.): Einleitung zum Lesen der Offenb. St. Joh. 1860.

CARPENTER: The Revelation of John the Divine (Handy Comm. series). 1883.

CHRISTIANI: Übers. Darstellung des Inhalts. 1869.

COWLES: The Revelation of John. 1871.

CUMMING: Lectures. 2 vols. 1849–51.

DESPREZ: The Apocalypse fulfilled. New ed. 1865.

DE WETTE: Kurz Erklärung d. O. T. 3d ed. 1862.

DIEDRICH: Die Offenb. Joh. kurz erläutert. 1865.

DEUTINGER: Die christliche Ethik nach dem Ap. Joh.; Vorträge über die Briefe und die Offenb. 1867.

EBRARD: Die Off. Joh. (vol. vii. of Olshausen's Comm.). 1859.

ELLIOTT: Horae Apocalypticae. 4 vols. 5th ed. 1862.

EICHHORN: Comm. in Apoc. J. 2 vols. 1781.

EWALD: Comm. in Apoc. exeg. et crit. 1828.
Die johann. Schriften. 1862. vol. ii.

FARRAR: The Early Days of Christianity. 1882. pp. 437–493.
FÜLLER: Erklärung. 1874.
FULLER (S.): The Revelation of St. John. 1885.

GÄRTNER: Erkl. des Pr. Daniel u. d. Offenb. 1863.
GARRATT: Commentary on the Revelation. 1878.
GEBHARDT: Lehrbegriff d. Apok. 1873. English translation, 1878.
GERHARD (J.): Annot. 1643, 1645, 1712.
GODET: Studies on the N. T. English translation. pp. 294–398.
GRÄBER: Versuch einer hist. Erkl. 1863.

HAHN: Leitfaden zum Verständnisse, etc. 1851.
HARMS (CLAUS): Die Offenb. gepredigt. 1844.
HÄVERNICK: Über die neueste Behandl. u. Ausleg. d. Apok. 1834.
HEIDEGGER: Diatribe. 2 vols. 1687.
HEINRICHS: Annotatio. 2 vols. 1818, 1821.
HENGSTENBERG: Erläuterung. 2 vols. 1849, 1850. English trans., 1851–53.
HERDER: Μαραν Αθα, das Buch von der Zukunft d. Herrn. 1779. English translation, 1821.
HESS: Briefe über die Offenbarung. 1843.
HEUBNER: Predigten ü. die 7 Sendschreiben. 3d ed. 1850.
HILGENFELD: Nero der Antichrist (Zeitschrift für wissensch. Theol.). 1869. iv.
HOFFMANN (W.): Maranatha. 1858.
HOLTZHAUSER: Erklärung. 1827.
HOLTZMANN: (in Bunsen's Bibelwerk) 1858.
HUNTINGFORD: The Voice of the Last Prophet. 1858.
The Apocalypse, with Commentary, etc. 1881.
HUSCHKE: Das Buch mit 7 Siegels. 1860.

JENAUR: Rationale Apok. 2 vols. 1852.
JESSIN: Erklärung. 1864.
JOHANNSEN: Die Offenb. J. 1788.

KELLY: The Revelation of John. 1860, 1871.
KEMMLER: Die Offenb. Jesu Christi an Joh. 1863.
KIENLEN: Commentaire. 1870.
† KIRCHER: Explicatio. 1676.
KLEUKER: Urspr. u. Zweck. 1799.
KLIEFOTH: Erklärung. 3 vols. 1874.

KREMMENTZ: Die Offenb. J. im Lichte d. Evang. nach J. 1883.
KROMAYER (J.): Commentarius. 1662, 1674.

LÄMMERT: Die Offenb. J. durch d. h. Schrift ausgelegt. 1864.
LANGE: (in Bibelwerk) 1870. English translation, 1874.
LORD: Exposition. 1831.
LÖWE: Weissagung u. Weltgeschichte. 1868.
LUTHARDT: Die Offenb. J. übersetzt u. kurz erklärt. 1860. (Die Lehre von den letzen Dingen, 1861.)

MAITLAND: The Apostles' School of Prophetic Interpretation. 1849.
† MARLORATUS: Exposition. 1574.
MATTHÄI: Erklärung. 1828.
MAURICE: Lectures. 1861.
MEDE: Clavis Apocalyptica. 1627.
Commentarius. 1632.
MILLIGAN: (in Schaff's Popular Commentary) 1883.
The Revelation of St. John. Boyle Lectures for 1885.
MURPHY: The Book of Revelation. 1882.

NAPIER: Interpretation. 1593, 1611, 1645. (Also in French, Dutch, and German.)
NEWTON (B. M.): Thoughts on the Apocalypse. 1843.
NEWTON (Sir I.): Observations on Daniel and the Revelation of St. John. 1733. Lat., 1737.
NEWTON (Bishop THOMAS): Dissertation on the Prophecies. Last ed. 1843.

OOSTERZEE (v.): Christus unter den Leuchtern. 1874.

PAREUS: Comment. in Apoc. 1618.
PHILIPPI: Der Lehre von Antichrist. 1875.
PLUMPTRE: The Epistles to the Seven Churches. 1877.
POND: The Seals opened. 1871.

RICHTER: Kurzgef. Auslegung. 1864.
RIEMANN: Die Offenb. Joh. für chr. Volk. 1868.
RINCK: Die Zeichen der letzen Zeit, and der Lehre von Antichrist. 1868.
ROUGEMONT: La Révél. de St. Jean. 1866.

SABEL: Die Offenb. aus dem Zusammenlung der mess. Reichsgesch. 1861.
SANDER: Versuch einer Erkl. 1829.
SCHMUCKER (J. G.): Erklärung. Also translated into English, 1845.
SCHRÖDER: Auff. der Offenb. (Jahr-Buch f. d. Theol., 1864).

Seiss: Lectures. 1869–73.
Selnecker: Erklärung. 1567, 1568, 1608.
† Stern: Komment. über die Offenb. 1854.
Storr: Neue Apologie der Offenb. 1805.
Stuart: Commentary on the Apoc. 2 vols. 1845.
Svobode: On the Seven Churches. 1869.

Tait: The Messages to the Seven Churches. 1884.
Trench: The Epistles to the Seven Churches. 1861.

Vaughn: Lectures. 1863.
Vitringa: Anacrisis. 1705.
Volkmar: Commentary. 1862.

Weiss: Apok. Studien (in Stud. u. Kr., 1869).
Wiesseler: Zur Auslegung u. krit. apok. Lit. 1839.
Wordsworth: Lectures. 1848.
Züllig: Die Offenb. J. vollst. erkl. 1834, 1840.

THE REVELATION OF ST. JOHN.

INTRODUCTION.

Cf. F. Lücke, *Versuch einer vollst. Einl. in die Offenb. des Johannes u. in die apokalypt. Literatur überhaupt.* 2d ed., Bonn, 1848, 1852. Also the review of it by Bleek, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1854, p. 959; 1855, p. 159.

SEC. I. — CONTENTS, PLAN, UNITY, AND FORM OF THE APOCALYPSE.

1. As to *contents*, the Apocalypse falls into three manifestly distinct chief divisions.[1] For, with the most closely cohering series of visions, complete in themselves, of ch. iv. 1–xxii. 5, which form the *chief theme*, as the fulness of the Apocalyptic subjects are all here brought into contemplation, the first three chapters are related in several ways (cf. i. 1–3; ver. 4 sqq.; ver. 9 sqq.; ii. 1 sqq.), as the *introduction;* while the section xxii. 6–21, expressly indicating a concluding retrospect of what precedes (ver. 6), forms the *epilogue.*

Note. — Even though the book be divided according to its formal organism,[2] *three* main divisions, but of different compass, still result. For then the chief theme is manifestly the entire recital of the visions imparted to John, from i. 9 to xxii. 17 (all "the words of the prophecy of this book," xxii. 18; cf. i. 3), which the prophet in describing them to the churches accompanies with his own preface (i. 1–8) and conclusion (xxii. 18–21). Ewald's division into four parts (title and introduction, i. 1–8; the briefer vision with the seven epistles, i. 9–iii. 22; the long series of connected visions, iv. 1–xxii. 5; conclusion, xxii. 6–21) depends upon a confusion of the material and formal principles of division. Hence the separation of chs. iii. and iv. seems as groundless as the grouping together of xxii. 6–21.

[1] Beng., Lücke, De Wette, etc.

[2] Cf. Vitringa.

A survey of the contents in detail must here be given, so far as not only its methodical design, but also its unity, is thereby perceptible.

The *Introduction* (chs. i.–iii.) contains, in the first place (i. 1–3), the preface, properly so called, in which the book is designated (i. 1, 2) according to its nature and contents; viz., as a prophetical writing, which is to present a revelation of God, through Jesus Christ, concerning events that are to occur in the near future, and is therefore most urgently commended (ver. 3). Then follows the preface of John, its writer (i. 4–8), to the seven churches of Asia Minor (cf. i. 11, ch. ii. 3), as the first readers of the prophetical book; a preface which not only presents a salutation in accord with the entire contents of the book (i. 4–6), but also — after the manner of the ancient prophets — expresses at the very outstart, in short and sententious phrases (vv. 7, 8), the fundamental idea, and to a certain extent the theme, of the whole book. But if John, as the prophetic deliverer of a divine revelation, already in i. 1–3 and vv. 4–8 addresses particular churches, so he now reports (i. 9–20) how on a Lord's Day the Lord had himself appeared to him, and given the express command that what he saw (vv. 11, 19), — and, therefore, not only this manifestation of the Lord in calling him, but also the entire ἀποκάλυψις (revelation) (i. 1) described from the fourth chapter, — he should write to the churches named in ver. 11. With this, he intrusts to John special letters to all those churches (ii. 1–iii. 22); in which, according to the various conditions, necessities, and dangers of each church, the sum of the entire revelation (discernible already from i. 7 sq.; cf. i. 1, 3) is elaborated and applied for their consolation.

The proper *chief subject* of the prophetic book (iv. 1–xxii. 5) then introduces the report committed to writing by John, in compliance with the command (i. 11, 19), concerning a series of visions, in which there is given to the prophet beholding them the revelation concerning things to come (ἃ δεῖ γενέσθαι, iv. 1; cf. i. 1), which he is to testify to the churches. John, in compliance with a heavenly voice, taken up into the opened heaven, beholds God (the Father) upon his throne, surrounded by twenty-four elders, who likewise sit upon thrones. About the throne of God, there are also four beings who are described as cherubim. These beings, whose song of praise the elders adoringly continue, worship God enthroned, as the thrice holy, the Almighty, eternal Lord, which was, and is, and is to come (ch. iv.; cf. ver. 8 with i. 4, 8).

In the right hand of him that sits on the throne, John now sees a book written within and without, and sealed with seven seals (v. 1). At the loud cry of a strong angel, "Who is worthy to open the book, and to loose the seals thereof?" no one able to do this is found in the entire circuit of

creation. Yet John, who weeps over this, as he has learned that the book contains the future things which he was to behold, is encouraged by one of the elders, who points him to the Lion of the tribe of Judah, who has prevailed, to the Son of David, as the one who is worthy to open the book (v. 2–5). Then John sees in the midst of the throne and of the four beings and the elders, a Lamb standing as it had been slain, with seven horns and seven eyes (v. 6). This Lamb takes the book out of the right hand of him that sits upon the throne (ver. 7); upon which the four beings and the twenty-four elders celebrate his worthiness to open the book, and offer as the reason (cf. already ver. 5) the fact that the Lamb was slain, and has accomplished the work of redemption (vv. 8–10). All angels, yea all creatures, now unite in the ascription of praise to him who sits upon the throne, and to the Lamb (vv. 11–14).

Upon this the Lamb begins (vi. 1) to unseal the book of fate; and John beholds not words written in the book, but significative forms and events as representations (cf. i. 1, *ἐσήμανεν*, be signified) of what was to happen (cf. iv. 1). After the opening of the *first* seal (vi. 2), John beholds a rider upon a white horse, and with a bow in his hand. A crown is given to him: he is a conqueror, and goes forth to conquer. The *second* seal (vi. 3 sq.) brings a rider upon a flaming red horse. He receives a great sword: he is to take peace from the earth, that men should kill one another. From the *third* seal (vi. 5 sq.) comes a black horse, whose rider holds a pair of balances. A voice which is heard in the midst of the four beings proclaims famine. The *fourth* seal (vi. 7 sq.) brings a pale, livid horse, whose rider is called Death. He is to bring death to the fourth part of the earth, by the sword and hunger and other plagues. When the *fifth* seal (vi. 9–11) is opened, John hears how the souls of those who have been slain because of the word of God, cry to God from under the altar, as to how long he would delay to avenge their shed blood upon those who dwell upon the earth. To each of these martyrs a white robe is given, and it is said to them that a certain number of their brethren must first be killed. After the opening of the *sixth* seal (vi. 12–17), a mighty earthquake occurs, the sun is darkened, the stars fall upon the earth, the heaven is rent asunder, all mountains and islands are removed from their places, and the cries of alarm by the dwellers upon earth testify what also the fearful signs make known; viz., that the great day of God's wrathful judgment has come.

This final judgment, as the end of what is to happen, is to be expected now in the last or seventh seal. But the complete final development proceeds from this last seal only through a long series of further visions. Before it is opened, another event occurs in ch. vii. John beholds four

angels, who stand upon the four corners of the earth, and hold there the four winds of the earth, in order that they may not yet break forth and inflict injury. For, as another angel who holds the seals of the living God cries out, the servants of God must first be marked on their foreheads with this seal (vii. 1–3). The number sealed out of Israel, John hears: they are one hundred and forty-four thousand; out of every tribe, twelve thousand (vii. 4–8). But hereupon he sees an innumerable multitude of all nations and tongues, standing before the throne of God and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and with palms in their hands, raising songs of praise in which the angels unite. These are they, as one of the elders says, which came out of great tribulation, and have entered into the glory of heaven (vv. 9–17).

After this episode, the *seventh* seal is opened by the Lamb (viii. 1). Silence in heaven for about a half hour follows, during which the seven angels receive seven trumpets (viii. 2). Another angel comes, and places himself by the altar, with a golden censer in his hand, because he is to offer up incense with the prayers of the saints, and thus to make them acceptable (v. 3 sq.). As a testimony that the prayers are heard, and that what follows is a consequence of the hearing of the prayer, the angel fills his censer with fire from the altar, and casts it upon the earth. Threatening signs follow, interrupting the silence which has hitherto prevailed, and giving the signal to the seven angels with the trumpets, who prepare to sound them (ver. 5 sq.). At the blast of the *first* trumpet (viii. 7), hail and fire, mingled with blood, fall upon the earth; and the third of all that grows upon it is consumed. The *second* trumpet (viii. 8 sq.) brings a great mountain, aflame with fire, which, on being cast into the sea, changes one-third of it into blood, and causes the death and destruction of the third of all living creatures in the sea, and of all ships. At the *third* trumpet (viii. 10 sq.), a burning star falls upon the third of the streams and springs, whose waters it makes bitter (its name is "Wormwood"), so that many men die thereby. At the *fourth* trumpet (viii. 12), the third of the sun and of the moon and of all the stars is darkened, and accordingly a third of the day, while a third of the night is deprived of the light of stars.

Before the three angels still remaining sound their trumpets, John hears an eagle, flying in the zenith, proclaim a threefold woe upon those who dwell upon the earth, because of the three blasts of the trumpets that are yet to come (viii. 13). The *fifth* trumpet (ix. 1–11) brings from hell an army of locusts, which for five months were to fearfully torment, but not to kill, the men who were not sealed (cf. vii. 1 sq.). This is the *first woe:* two others follow (ix. 12). At the blast of the *sixth* trumpet (ix. 13–21), the command

is given, through a voice from the horns of the altar, to the sixth angel having a trumpet, to loose the four angels which are bound in the Euphrates, but are ready to rush upon the earth with an immense demoniacal army of horsemen, and to slay a third part of men. This happens, and yet the survivors do not repent.

The plague announced by the sixth trumpet belongs, of course, to the second woe (cf. viii. 13), but is not yet fulfilled (cf. xi. 14). Hence the seventh trumpet does not immediately sound; and there follows next, in chap. x., a significant digression, to which the part of the second woe that still remains (xi. 1–13) is added.

A mighty angel, having a little book in his hand, comes from heaven, and puts his feet, which are like pillars of fire, the right upon the sea, and the left upon the earth (x. 1 sq.). Seven thunders answer his loud call with their voices, which John understands, but is not to write, but to seal (ver. 3 sq.). The angel now swears that forthwith, viz., in the days of the seventh trumpet, the blessed and glorious end will come, when the mystery of God, as He himself has proclaimed it to the prophets, will be finished (vv. 5–7). Thereupon, at the command of a heavenly voice, John takes the little book from the angel's hand, and swallows it. It is, as the angel said, as sweet to him in the mouth as honey, but bitter in his belly. A heavenly voice interprets this eating of the book: John is to prophesy again before peoples and tongues and many kings (vv. 8–11).

This new prophecy immediately begins. A reed is given to the seer, with which he is to measure the temple at Jerusalem, and the altar, together with those who worship in the temple, in order to separate what is measured from the court and the city, which for forty-two months is to be trodden down by the heathen (xi. 1 sq.). During this time, two witnesses of Christ, furnished with divine power to work miracles, are to preach repentance. But the beast out of the pit will kill them, and their corpses are to lie unburied in the streets of the great city, which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, where also the Lord of those witnesses was crucified (ver. 8), for three days and a half, to the joy of the godless inhabitants of the earth (vv. 3–10). Yet after three days and a half — so John further reports his vision — the two witnesses are again awakened by God, and raised to heaven before the eyes of their terrified enemies (ver. 11 sq.). At the same time, a great earthquake destroys a tenth of the city, and kills seven thousand inhabitants, whereby the rest are brought to repentance (ver. 13). With this judgment upon Jerusalem, the *second* woe is finished. The third follows quickly (xi. 14).

The *seventh* trumpet also now sounds (xi. 15), whereupon various songs

of praise arise in heaven, which celebrate the fulfilment of the mystery of God — to be expected, according to x. 7, from the seventh trumpet — as having already occurred, and the day of wrathful judgment upon the heathen as having already come (vv. 15–18). The temple of God in heaven is opened, so that the ark of the covenant contained therein is visible; and other threatening signs occur like those in viii. 5 (xi. 19).

But the third woe in its actual coming is still not yet seen; and if the heavenly songs of praise and thanksgiving (xi. 15–18) celebrate the glorious end as already come, this can be only a prolepsis, which has its correct application in this, that the seventh trumpet is now sounded, and is partly the more fitting, as it is the inhabitants of heaven who, when the seventh sound of the trumpet has given the signal of the fulfilment, regard this as having already occurred. Yet a further revelation to John follows, concerning the days of the seventh trumpet, which in fact still impend (cf. x. 7), in a new series of visions, through which future things, as they actually belong to the fulfilment of the mystery of God, are represented. This blessed end (xxi. 1 sqq.), to which the divine gospel in the prophets points promissively (cf. x. 7), can come only through the complete judgment upon all that is ungodly (chs. xvii. sqq.). Yet the description of this judgment can be satisfactorily explained only by a description of that which is ungodly in its inmost nature and most peculiar forms of appearance. The latter forms the chief scope of chs. xii.–xvi. Nevertheless, even here there is no lack of elements pointing forward and giving assurance of systematic progress.

John beholds in heaven a woman clothed with the sun, the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars. She is with child, and is about to give birth (xii. 1 sq.). There appears a great flaming-red dragon, with seven heads, ten horns, and seven crowns. His tail sweeps a third of the stars of heaven, and casts them upon the earth. He puts himself before the travailing woman, in order, after the birth, to devour the child (xii. 3 sqq.). The woman bears a son who is to rule all the nations with a rod of iron. The child is caught up unto God, and God's throne. The woman flees into the wilderness, where she has a place prepared for her, that she should be fed there twelve hundred and sixty days (xii. 5 sq.). A conflict now arises in heaven between Michael, together with his angels, and the dragon (i.e., the devil) and his angels; and the latter are cast to the earth (vv. 7–9). This victory is celebrated by a loud voice in heaven, praising God and his Christ; but at the same time proclaiming wrath upon the earth and the sea, because the devil, cast down thereto, would exert his great wrath during the brief period allowed him (vv. 10–12). The dragon

persecutes the woman; but she receives two wings of an eagle, in order to fly into the wilderness to her place (ver. 13 sq.). In vain the dragon casts after the woman a stream of water, which the earth swallows up, so that he departs to contend with the rest of the seed of the woman (vv. 13–17).

The dragon goes upon the shore of the sea (vv. 11, 18), from which a beast rises with ten horns, seven heads, ten crowns, and names of blasphemy upon its heads. It is like a leopard, but has the feet of a bear, and the mouth of a lion; it receives from the dragon its power and throne (xiii. 1 sq.). One of its heads is wounded unto death, but the deadly wound is healed (xiii. 3). The whole earth wonders at the beast, and worships the dragon. The beast dares to speak blasphemies, and to contend victoriously with the saints. It has power over the whole earth for forty-two months (ver. 5), and is worshipped by all who do not belong to the Lamb (vv. 4–8), — a fearful prophecy which John commits to writing, not without adding an intimation concerning the judgment upon this ungodly being, and admonishing the saints to patience and faith (ver. 9 sq.). Upon this, John sees another beast rise from the earth, with two horns like a lamb, and speaking like a dragon (xiii. 11). By seduction, miracles, and force (ver. 17), this beast causes the dwellers upon earth to worship the former beast (xiii. 12–17). The number to explain its name to one having understanding is 666 (ver. 18).

Another vision follows essentially in the sense of the intercalated paracletic section of xiii. 9 sq. On Mount Zion stands the Lamb, with a hundred and forty-four thousand of his people, while heavenly voices sing before God's throne a new song which only the redeemed can learn. An angel, with the everlasting gospel intended for all dwellers upon earth, flying in the zenith, demands conversion to the true God, while he testifies that the hour of judgment has come (xiv. 6 sq.). Another angel proclaims the fall of great Babylon as having already occurred (ver. 8); and a third, the eternal punishment of the worshippers of the beast (vv. 9–11). There is next a paracletic digression of John (ver. 12); also a heavenly voice commands him to write that they who die in the Lord are blessed (ver. 13). Then the course of the development towards the *end*, whose next goal ver. 8 already proleptically marks, again continues. Upon a white cloud appears one like the Son of man, with a golden crown upon his head, and a sharp sickle in his hand. From the temple comes another angel, who calls to him who sits upon the cloud, to begin with the sickle the harvest, for which the time has come. The latter then thrusts his sickle into the earth, which is harvested (vv. 14–16). Still another angel comes forth out of the heavenly temple, likewise holding a sharp sickle, which, by the order of an angel coming

forth from the altar, he thrusts into the earth. Thus the vine of the earth is harvested, and the wine-press is trodden outside of the city; the blood which proceeds therefrom extends to the horses' bridles, sixteen hundred furlongs (17–20).

A new, astonishing sign in heaven appears to the seer: the seven angels having the seven last plagues; for in them is the wrath of God fulfilled (xv. 1). After a hymn of the victors over the beast, who, in the song of Moses and the Lamb, proclaim the righteousness of God and his glory, which is to be worshipped by all the nations (vv. 2–4), those seven angels come forth from God's temple, and receive from one of the four beings seven golden vials filled with the wrath of the everlasting God (vv. 5–7). The temple is filled with smoke from the glory and power of God, so that no one can enter therein until the seven plagues of the seven angels are fulfilled (ver. 8). A voice from the temple now commands the seven angels to pour their vials upon the earth (xvi. 1). The *first* vial, poured out upon the earth (xvi. 2), brings a severe ulcer upon the men who bear the mark of the beast, and worship his image. The *second* vial (ver. 3), poured out upon the sea, changes it into blood as of a dead man; every thing living in the sea dies. The *third* vial (ver. 4), poured out upon the rivers and springs, changes them into blood. The angel of the waters glorifies the righteousness of the divine judgments; so, too, the angel of the altar (vv. 5–7). The *fourth* vial (ver. 8 sq.), poured out upon the sun, causes a heat that scorches men. But all these plagues work no repentance. The *fifth* vial (ver. 10 sq.), poured out upon the throne of the beast, causes darkness in his kingdom, but only new blasphemies on the part of those who are afflicted. The *sixth* vial (vv. 12–16) is poured upon the Euphrates, which is dried, that the way may be prepared for the kings of the East. Out of the mouths of the dragon, the beast, and the false prophet, come three unclean spirits, like frogs, which gather the kings for the struggle of that great day — "Behold, the Lord cometh quickly: blessed is he that watcheth" (ver. 15) — and that, too, to the place called in Hebrew, Armageddon. The *seventh* vial (vv. 17–21) is poured out into the air. A heavenly voice cries, "It is done." Amidst voices, lightnings, and thunders, an unprecedented earthquake occurs, which divides the great city into three parts, and overthrows the cities of the nations. Islands and mountains vanish (cf. vi. 14). A great hail falls. Yet men continue their blasphemies. One of the seven angels having the vials now comes to John, and wishes to show him the judgment of the great harlot, with whom the kings and the inhabitants of the earth in general have committed fornication (xvii. 1 sq.). He carries the seer, in spirit, into the wilderness. There sits upon a scarlet-colored beast, covered

with names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns, a wanton woman, having in her hand a cup full of abominations, and upon her forehead a name written which designates her as Babylon, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth. She is drunken with the blood of saints (vv. 2–6). To the astonished John, the angel explains the mystery of the woman and the beast (xvii. 7–18). Another angel proclaims the fall of great Babylon as having already occurred (cf. xiv. 8), and declares that her sins are the cause of the judgment (xviii. 1–3). Another voice from heaven first commands the servants of God to go forth out of Babylon, in order to share neither her sins nor her plagues (ver. 4); and then, to more firmly establish the burden of her sins, describes her complete ruin (xviii. 5–20), which another angel portrays by casting a great millstone into the sea, thus describing the destruction of the godless city, stained by the blood of martyrs (vv. 21–24). Thus the fulfilled judgment upon the great harlot is celebrated in heaven with songs of praises (xix. 1–8). Before, however, the other ungodly powers are judged, there follows, in a brief digression (xix. 9 sq.), an allusion to the blessed fulfilment of the mystery of God (cf. x. 7) at the marriage-supper of the Lamb; for already a chief act of the judgment is accomplished, whereby that glorious end will be attained. The description of the other acts of judgment continues directly afterward (xix. 11). Christ himself, with his followers, goes forth from the opened heaven (xix. 11–16), — while an angel, standing in the sun, with a loud voice calls together the birds to eat the flesh of the inhabitants of the earth (ver. 17 sq.), — against the beast, which with his army awaits the conflict (ver. 19). The beast and the false prophet are cast alive into the lake of fire; the rest are slain with the sword which proceeds from the mouth of Christ, and all the birds are filled with their flesh (v. 20 sq.). Then Satan himself is bound for a thousand years by an angel coming out of heaven, and cast into the abyss, whence he is to be loosed again for a short time after that period (xx. 1–3). During the thousand years, those reign with Christ who for his sake have been slain, and have not served the beast, after they have been raised from the dead, — the first resurrection (vv. 4–6). After the expiration of the thousand years, Satan loosed goes forth to deceive the nations in the four ends of the earth, Gog and Magog, and to bring them together for battle. They also rise up over the surface of the earth, and surround the camp of the saints, the beloved city; but fire from heaven consumes them, and they are cast to eternal torments in the lake of fire (xx. 7–10). Then finally, in the judgment of the world, in which all the dead appear before the gloriously enthroned Judge (the second resurrection; cf. ver. 5), all those whose names are not found written in the book of

life, together with death and hell, are cast out. This is the second death (xx. 11-15).

The entire judgment of every thing ungodly is thus completed. There follows, finally (xxi. 1–xxii. 5), the presentation of the blessed mystery of God, in its actual fulfilment (cf. x. 7). John beholds a new heaven and a new earth, and the new Jerusalem descending from heaven as an adorned bride (xxi. 1 sq.); at which not only a voice from heaven proclaims the eternal blessedness of those dwelling with God, but also he that sitteth on the throne himself testifies that the eternal fulfilment is accomplished, both in the glorification of the believing victors, and in the condemnation of all the godless (vv. 3–8). But one of the seven angels having the vials wishes to show John the Lamb's bride more closely; therefore he brings the seer in spirit to a high mountain (ver. 9 sq.), whence he beholds the new Jerusalem in the glory of God, as it is described, xxi. 11–xxii. 5. Thus has the revelation, begun in ch. iv., attained its highest goal, and exhausted its subject; it has disclosed, up to the eternal accomplishment, that which was to come to pass (cf. iv. 1–i. 1). The two parts of the epilogue (vv. 6–17, 18–21), still following, conclude in a twofold respect all that precedes. On the one hand, the visions by means of which there is imparted to John the revelation concerning future things (ver. 6, ἃ δεῖ γενέσθαι ἐν τάχει) are closed, since an angel, who, in Christ's name, speaks with John, confirms the certainty and importance of that which John has seen, and is to publish in his prophetical writing, and repeatedly testifies to the fundamental truth that the Lord is coming (vv. 6–17). On the other hand, the prophet himself completes his writing, in which, according to the command received, he has communicated the revelation given him, with the solemn testimony of the divine punishment of those who will either add any thing to, or subtract any thing from, the prophecies in this his book (ver. 18 sq.). But, as the Lord promises his speedy coming, the prophet answers with a cry of longing for this coming (ver. 20). With a benediction upon the reader, corresponding to the introductory greeting (cf. i. 4 sqq.), the whole is finished (ver. 21).

2. The leading features of *the plan*, according to which the Apocalypse is skilfully designed, are clearly manifest already from this summary of the contents; but a more minute account not only is necessary for the establishment of the critical view of the complete and original unity of the present book, but also gives the most certain norm for the entire exposition, since it proceeds from the context itself. The question is especially concerning the central chief division of the book (iv. 1–xxii. 5); for the section from xxii. 6 is to be regarded as the conclusion, upon which there is as little controversy among expositors as there is concerning the introductory design of

chs. i.-iii., although, of course, the meaning of the seven epistles (chs. ii., iii.), in themselves, and in their relation to the proper revelation (chs. iv. 1–xxii. 5), is variously comprehended. Yet this depends upon the view of the development and disposition of the central chief subject. John himself testifies (i. 10) that he has written the visions of his prophetic book on *one* day.[1] It is never declared that in the course of the revelation of the future he has ever actually abandoned[2] the standpoint to which he was raised at its beginning (iv. 1),[3] while it is self-evident that in his never-interrupted ecstatic condition, from iv. 1–xxii. 5, he yet can be conscious of a change of standpoint (cf. x. 1, xvii. 3, xxi. 10; and especially xi. 1 sqq., where the seer in his trance must even be active); and as, even externally regarded, the report of the visions in no way admits the meaning that the individual parts of the revelation are immediately recorded the one after the other, after John has received them through sight and hearing:[4] so the revelation described in ch. iv., in its inner formation, is controlled from the beginning on by a development having unity, and directly tending towards a final goal. For the book of fate, at the throne of God (chap. v.), contains beneath its seven seals just that which is to be revealed to John, and then to be prophetically published by him; viz., ἃ δεῖ γενέσθαι, "the things which must come to pass" (cf. iv. 1–i. 1). If no one be found able to open the seals, the future also remains concealed from John (v. 4). But Christ, the Mediator of revelation (cf. i. 1), opens the seals, so that significant visions now appear to the seer, which describe to him the future things. If, in this entire fundamental idea of the book of fate, there is to be sense and order, neither can that which proceeds from the sixth seal already be regarded as the complete representation of the actual final judgment, — i.e., with the sixth seal, all revelation to its very end be once for all exhausted,[5] — neither can any thing concerning the future be revealed, which is not included in the book of fate, and to be interpreted as proceeding from the seals.[6] The occasion for misunderstanding this formal fundamental law, controlling the entire composition of the Apocalypse, lies in this, that the sixth seal (vi. 12–17) is not immediately followed by the seventh (viii. 1), and that even the seventh seal does not bring, after the analogy of that which precedes, a vision that is definite and in itself intelligible, with which, then, the revelation proceed-

[1] Against Grotius and others, who wish to distinguish the visions by different times.

[2] Against De Wette, etc.

[3] But not i. 10–18, as Klief. proposes; cf. on i. 20.

[4] Against Bengel, *Erklärte Offenb. Joh.*, Stuttg., 1740, p. 296 sq.

[5] As with Hofmann.

[6] Against Hengstenberg, Ebrard, and, in general, against the entire theory of a *recapitulatio*. (See author's note below.)

ing from the sealed book of fate is to end, but rather, in another form (the seven trumpets), constitutes a new series of visions, or rather evolves them from itself.

The same art, however, with which John at the crisis of the seventh seal opens, as it were, a new path, which in its beginning is based upon the conclusion of the first (viz., in the seven seals, viii. 1), meets us again at the similar second crisis; namely, where, after the close of the vision of the six trumpets (ix. 21), the seventh trumpet, and with it the end of the entire revelation, is to be expected. As, between the sixth and the seventh seals, a digression of essentially progressive significance enters (ch. vii.), so also between the sixth and seventh trumpets (ch. x.). And if already, at that first crisis, many an expositor loses the course of the argument, this danger is all the more imminent at the second crisis, as not only externally the peculiar digression of ch. x., where John is provided with new prophecies, enters as a distinct revelation, not proceeding from the sixth trumpet (xi. 1–14), but also that which is directly represented after the blast of the seventh trumpet (xi. 15–19), may appear at first sight as the actual description of the complete end; from which, then, it would follow, that what succeeds ch. xii. forms an entirely new beginning, completely independent of the original plan of a series of seals and trumpets. There would consequently be a complete break between chs. xi. and xii. But this misunderstanding is obviated in a twofold way by the formal organism itself: first, between the fourth and fifth trumpets, three woes are proclaimed as still impending, of which the first two occur before the seventh trumpet; and, secondly, in the digression, x. 7, pointing to a new prophecy to all nations and many kings (cf. x. 11), it is expressly said that the seventh trumpet will bring the glorious fulfilment of the blessed mystery of God. But neither does the small section, xi. 15–19, contain the account of the fulfilment of the mystery of God, nor within xi. 1–14 do we find the demands of the prediction given to the prophet at x. 11 satisfied. On the contrary, the entire section, xii. 1–xxii. 5, contains all that according to viii. 13, x. 7, and x. 11, is still to be expected; viz., not only the third woe, which is truly analogous to the two first in seven vials of wrath, and with the same the detailed account of the final judgment of all that is ungodly, especially the definite prophecy concerning the kings and nations in the service of the beast which comes from the abyss (cf. already xi. 7, where the reach of the second woe extends across into that of the third), but also the description of the final glory in which the mystery of God is to be fulfilled. If, therefore, that which succeeds ch. xii. does not result from the seven trumpets in the same express form in which the series of the seven trumpets issues from the seven seals

(cf. especially the remarks to ch. xii., in the exposition), yet not only is the inner connection with that original design maintained, but the external conformity is to be recognized besides in this, that, in clear analogy with the seven vials and the seven trumpets, the third woe appears in the form of seven vials. Thus it may be well said, in accordance with the original design of the Apocalypse (but, of course, without regard to the manner in which that original design is modified by chap. xii.), that the seventh seal, through the seven trumpets which also proceed therefrom, extends to xxii. 5. John, then, has seen all that is to happen; and the secret contents of the book of fate, sealed with the seven seals, are completely disclosed.

Note. — This statement follows the course already indicated by Bengel, and, more safely and without his false side-look, by Lücke, Bleek, Ewald, and De Wette. It is opposed to the ancient and modern views which proceed from the theory of the *Recapitulatio*. This theory, which has been and still is highly influential in the exposition of the Apocalypse, even to the most minute details, owes its importance to Augustine, who in his renowned work, the *De Civitate Dei*, I. xx., c. 7–17, elaborately discusses the eschatological expressions in Rev. xx., xxi., especially with reference to the Donatist Tichonius, who wrote a much-read but lost commentary on the Apocalypse.[1] "To recapitulate" is the opposite of "observing the order." Augustine (l.c., c. 14): "He speaks by *recapitulating*, as returning to that which he had omitted, or rather had deferred. . . . That is, therefore, what I have said, that by recapitulating he has returned to that which he had passed over. But now he has observed the order," etc. To recapitulate, then, is when any thing is described at a later, while according to actual chronological order it should be described in a former, part of the book. By this exegetical canon of "recapitulation," Augustine attempts to remove the chief difficulty which he finds in the Apocalypse. "And in this book, indeed, many things are said obscurely to exercise the mind of the reader, and there are in it a few things from whose manifestation the rest may be laboriously traced, especially since it so repeats the same things in many ways, that it seems to speak now one thing and then another, although it is discovered speaking the very same things now in this way, and again in that" (l.c., c. 17). Recapitulation is not identical with repetition, although the Latin word *repetere* can be used also in the sense of *recapitulare* (l.c., c. 14); but already in Augustine both belong together, so that he fixes the course in accordance with which this entire theory has been so elaborated, that, by the apparent rule of recapitulation

[1] Concerning the relation of the exposition under the name of Tichonius on the Apoc. of St. John (Augustine's works, ed. Bened., vol. iii., App., p. 13), to the original work from which Beda especially (*Explic. Apoc. Opp. Col. Agripp.*, 1688, vol. v. p. 761) has taken the VII. Rules of Tichonius, cf. Lücke, p. 995.

and repetition, in fact the most immoderate and arbitrary freaks of exegesis may be justified. This is manifest already in Beda, since, mistaking the plan of the Apocalypse as a whole, because of a misunderstanding of the mutually interpenetrative construction of the seals and trumpets, he writes (*Prolog.*, l.c., p. 761): "Where, according to the custom of this book, it *observes the order* up to the sixth number, and, omitting the seventh, *recapitulates*, and, as if having followed the order, concludes the two narratives with the seventh. But even the recapitulation itself is to be understood according to the passages. For sometimes it recapitulates from the origin of the suffering, sometimes from the middle of the time, sometimes concerning the very latest persecution alone, or will not speak of what is much before." If, therefore, according to this view of the plan of the Apocalypse, the last seals could refer to things anterior to those of the preceding seals, or if, in the book, the trumpets succeeding the seals, and the vials succeeding the trumpets, could be stated to be a recapitulation of things which in reality belong under the seals, a true regularity of plan could not be acknowledged in these references which intersect one another. But the theory of recapitulation and repetition was, in this respect, very skilful. How if the first trumpet and the first vial by recapitulating referred to the same thing that had been referred to by the first seal, and if thus a regular parallelism would be shown between the seven seals, trumpets, and vials? Even to this extreme was the recapitulation theory carried by Nicholas Collado,[1] who was followed by David Pareus[2] and others. By the three forms of visions, viz., seals, trumpets, and vials, says Nic. Coll., the same thing is always described, and that, too, so that while the seals contain only a brief σκιαγραφία (sketch), the trumpets and seals always afford the more detailed images, to which then it is added, entirely in the sense of the ancient recapitulation theory: "Not what will be before or after among these seven, but in what order of discourses and signs they were indicated to John." The individual seals, trumpets, and vials correspond thus, each in its place, to one another, so that finally the seventh seal, the seventh trumpet, and the seventh vial in like manner concur in portraying the end of all things. In the results of this theory, Nic. Coll. does not allow himself to be deceived concerning the fact, that the individual parallel seals, trumpets, and vials, although represented as declaring the same thing with increasing clearness, yet occasionally express what, according to his own explanation, is directly the opposite. The fifth seal, e.g., speaks of the martyrs sacrificed by the Romish Church; but the fifth trumpet presents, in the figure of the locusts from hell, the Romish clergy, the mendicant monks, etc.; and the fifth vial, finally, portrays a divine wrathful judgment upon the Pope of Rome. But there is only this yet wanting, viz., to place under this law of

[1] *Methodus facillima ad explicationem sacrosanctae Apocalypseos Joannis theologi, ex ipso libro desumpta.* Marg., 1584.

[2] *Comment. in divin. Apoc.* Heidel., 1618. Opp. ed., Genev., T. II.

the recapitulating parallels, the seven epistles of chs. ii. and iii., whose close historical relation has long ago already been explained by most expositors as a mere foil[1] to what is, properly speaking, the prophetic contents. Yet this is done, not only by Ludw. Crocius,[2] Matth. Hofmann,[3] and Coccejus,[4] who accordingly assign seven periods to the entire N. T. time, but also by Campegius Vitringa,[5] the latter of whom is pre-eminently distinguished for his advocacy of the theory of the recapitulating parallelism in the plan of the Apocalypse, since, on the one hand, he represents this theory in its most remote consequences by including also the seven epistles in this parallelism, but, on the other hand, sees the necessity of being cautious in the application of the principle which he urges to an extreme. Vitringa does not say that all the seven letters, seals, trumpets, and vials each in every particular place correspond with one another; since such a complete correspondence in the formal arrangement is not supported by the prophetic contents, as Vitringa discovered by his exposition: on the contrary, he frankly modifies his judgment concerning this, conformably to the contents of the individual epistles, seals, trumpets, and vials, in the actual application of this principle of the recapitulating parallelism. Thus he frames a scheme of the book, which by its combination of the most accurate regularity, derived from the law of recapitulating parallelism urged to the extreme, and of the most confused irregularity, growing out of the interpretation of details that enter into the sphere of history, appears truly labyrinthine. According to Vitringa, the three first epistles, seals, and trumpets are actually parallel. Then the fourth and fifth trumpets alone extend farther. The fourth epistle has its parallel in the fourth seal and the sixth trumpet, at the close of which the vials are inserted. The fifth epistle, fifth seal, and end of the sixth trumpet have as their parallels, the first, second, third, and fourth vials; the sixth epistle has its parallel in the fifth and sixth vials. Then the seventh epistle stands alone. The sixth seal and seventh vial belong together; and finally the seventh seal, parallel with the seventh trumpet, completes the whole.

In this way is confusion introduced under one rule. And yet — to be silent concerning the older adherents of the system of Vitringa, as Joachim Lange[6] — Hofmann,[7] Hengstenberg, and Ebrard have turned back into this course, even though they very clearly differ in many places from Vitringa. Concerning Hengstenberg, who, in his theory of the groups of visions standing one beside the other, repeats the old recapitulation theory; and concerning Ebrard, who not

[1] [I.e., something of another kind, to set off something else to advantage.]

[2] *Syntagma theol.*, 1635.

[3] *Chronotas apocal.*, Opp. theol., 1674.

[4] *Cogitationes de Apoc.* Opp. Amstel., 1701, T. VI. Cf. also the *Synopsis et medulla prophetiae Cantici*, and the Commentary on the Song of Solomon, i. 1. Opp. T. II.

[5] Ἀνάκρισις Apokalypsios Joannis Apostoli, Franeq. 1705. Amstel., 1719.

[6] *Apokalyptisches Licht and Recht.* Halle, 1730.

[7] *Weiss. u. Erfüll.*, II., p. 300 sqq.

only parallelizes the prophetic range of the epistles with that of the following visions (since the epistles interpreted as partly consecutive and partly synchronistic, i.e., describing conditions of the Church partly following each other chronologically, and partly co-existing simultaneously, are regarded as extending to the very end), but also places the ultimate end at xi. 15 sqq., within the series of visions (iv. 1–xxii. 5), — we will speak at greater length on the basis of particular expositions of chs. ii., iii., viii. 1, xi. 15 sqq. Meanwhile we must here already judge how Hofmann's view of the plan and of what is closely connected therewith, viz., of the prophetic relation of the Apocalypse, is, notwithstanding peculiar modifications, essentially like the ancient recapitulation theory. Hofm., whom A. Christiani[1] follows, divides what is properly the Book of Revelation (ii. 1–xxii. 5) into five sections: I., chs. ii., iii.; II., iv. 1–viii. 1; III., viii. 2–xi. 19; IV., xii.–xiv.; V., xv. 1–xxii. 5 (xv. 1–xvi. 18, xvi. 18–xxii. 5). The first part, viz., the seven epistles, refers[2] to the circumstances of the present: iv. 1–viii. 1 proceeds to "the entire future," as there is here portrayed "all that belongs thereto, in order to bring about the divine mystery of our salvation." The three remaining sections (viii. 2–xxii. 5) refer "to the end," with the distinction that viii. 2–xi. 19 contains "God's final calls to repentance before the judgment;" chs. xii.–xiv., "the final struggle against the Church in the flesh;" and, finally, the section from xv. 1, on "the judgment of wrath upon the world, and the deliverance of the Church." To one not more fully acquainted with the peculiar view of Hofmann concerning the nature of prophecy, it must be inconceivable how he could at one time say that the seven epistles refer to the present, but likewise[3] that "corresponding to the seven pictures presented alongside of one another in the epistles, there will be in like manner seven forms of Christian congregational life belonging together, until the end of Church history, when the Lord sends the final trial upon his Church and the world, in order then himself to come," etc. But if we receive the statement concerning the seven epistles just as Hofmann presents it, the recapitulatory character of his view of the plan of the Apocalypse comes into view at once. Just this view, which in our opinion harmonizes neither in general with the true conception of prophecy, nor in particular with the context of chs. ii., iii., viz., that the epistles continue to prophesy until "*the end of Church history*," declares that Hofm. already, at the beginning of the book, finds the end of all things. The second section (iv. 1–viii. 1), by recapitulating, starts again from the beginning, and brings us to the end, at which Hofm., in viii. 1, stands a second time. For the third time we reach the end in xi. 19, after a recapitulation has occurred for the second time from viii. 2; and after the third recapitulation, beginning with xii. 1, we come to the end for the fourth time. It will be sufficient to indicate the misunderstanding from which this modification by Hofmann of the ancient recapitulation theory suffers, only with respect to the chief

[1] *Uebersichtl. Darst. des Inhalts der Apok.*, Dorpat, 1861. [2] p. 376. [3] p. 324 sq.

critical point in the course of the Apocalypse, viz., where there is a transition from the last seal to the trumpets. This misunderstanding depends upon two hypotheses, which only with great difficulty can be regarded consistent with the context: (1) Hofmann regards the sealed book of v. 1, as not containing that which is represented to John by the visions proceeding from the opened seals, but that in the book something was *written* which could be *known* only after the opening of the seven seals, and must be *realized* by the events portrayed in the history of the seals; that the proper contents of the book are nothing else than "the new condition of things to which God is leading through the occurrences of the present world." John, therefore, has reason to weep (v. 4); for, if the seals had remained unopened, "the blessed mystery of the future world, eternal life, would not have been attained."[1] But in this explanation the relation of the seals to the book is not stated in accordance with the text. For, if it be not those very things that stand written in the book as the divine decree, which are made manifest by the account of the seals, it will, on the one hand, be very difficult to comprehend how, from the seals which then could be designated only as comprehending the sphere of what God has reserved, the mystery of what is written in the book, such rich contents as the visions of the seals show could proceed; and, on the other, it must also be somewhere indicated, that in the book that stands written which Hofm. wishes to find in distinction from the revelation of the seals actually presented to us. Hofm., however, not only has his conjectures concerning the contents of the book, but also errs in deciding the relation of the seals to the professed contents, by making the fruition or fulfilment of the glorious condition of the new world professedly described in the book dependent upon the opening of the seals. It is of course in itself correct to say that the mystery of God will attain its fulfilment only with the consummation (cf. x. 7) of all that the visions of the seals show to be future; but this is not altogether the aspect under which the book with its seven seals is represented. For in v. 4, John weeps, not because, if no one can open the seals of the book, its contents must remain *unfulfilled*, but manifestly because then they must remain *unknown*. (2) But even granting that Hofm. has correctly divined the contents of the book, and correctly defined the relation of the seals, yet it would not follow that the seven trumpets proceeding from the seventh seal do not introduce a new series of visions, and that at viii. 1 we already stand at the real end. Especially according to Hofm.'s arrangement (cf. also Hengstb. and Christiani), is such a conception extremely difficult. Hofm. finds already in the sixth seal (vi. 12–17) the description of what is properly the judgment of the world. If we leave out of view the fact that he forces into this connection all also of ch. vii.,[2] and if we ask only concerning the contents of the seventh seal

[1] Cf. Christiani.

[2] Where, in the Judgment, in contrast with the alarmed world the well-concealed Church is described, viz., both the believing who are then still alive (vii. 1-8), and also the blessed dead (ver. 9 sq.), concerning which we are not

as distinguished from the professed contents of the book, Hofm. answers, "Thus the seventh seal can be opened; the last which still hinders the rolling-up of the book, i.e., the new world, can receive its beginning. This it was not for John to see. He only receives at the opening one impression, which is to make up for this vision: 'There was silence in heaven.'" In fact, the seventh seal thus has no contents whatever; it is only opened, not in order that the contents of the book may be seen or heard, but that thereby John, to whom what shall happen has been revealed in definite visions through all the preceding seals, may attain, by the ensuing silence, "an impression" of that which is to be fulfilled without his seeing it, and which, notwithstanding, is nothing less than the blessed goal both of his own and all other prophecies (cf. x. 7). Such an outline[1] of course urgently demands a completion, which is to be effected by "*recapitulating.*"

The recapitulation theory is applied by H. Kienlen (*Commentaire historique et critique sur l' Apocal.*, Paris, 1870. Cf. my notice in the *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1871, p. 566), with the modification that essentially there is but one recapitulation, viz., from vii. 1, after the close of chap. vi. has for the first time reached the full end. Kliefoth utterly rejects the theory, yet does not maintain entire independence of it. He thinks that the *parousia* has been brought to contemplation already in xiv. 14. The first part of the Apocalypse is to follow the progressive development of the Church up to the *parousia;* the last of the seven epistles (iii. 14 sqq.) is to represent the condition of the churches as they will be found by the Lord at his coming; while the second part, beginning with iv. 1, has as its proper subject the final events far in the future. The way to determine the meaning of particular passages corresponds to this form of recapitulation proposed by Kliefoth. He rejects the arbitrariness of allegorizing, yet not only has many allegorizing interpretations, but even presents concrete declarations in a way that may be called schematizing. Cf., e.g., xi. 8, xx. 9, where there will be found a description of the city of Jerusalem; but in this he has in mind the metropolis of Christianity at the end of time.

B. The methodical disposition of the Apocalypse is further conditioned by the number *seven*, and the numbers *three* and *four* as its components. There are seven epistles, seals, trumpets, vials. Thus the fundamental plan of the book may almost be said to be projected according to the number seven. But in this similarity there enters a diversity, by the resolution of seven into three and four. The first three epistles are distinguished from the last four by the construction of the conclusion. In the seals, the number *four* precedes, and *three* follows; for every time after the opening of the first four seals, one of the four beings, by whose introduction the scene is

to make the mistake that the world, whose destruction is described in the sixth seal, now appears as still (vii 1) existing.

[1] p. 12.

very significatively animated, summons the seer to come near. The first four trumpets, also, are distinguished from the three last: the latter are expressly proclaimed as three woes. Finally, in the vials, the first three are separated from the last four by voices which cease to be heard after the pouring-forth of the third vial.

NOTE 1. — It is incorrect, when treating of the art displayed in the plan of the book, to introduce still other numeral standards, which do not control the composition of Apocalyptic scripture, but belong only to its prophetic contents. The *ten* of the dragon's horns, the *seven* of his heads, the *two* of Christ's witnesses, etc., and all chronological numbers, as three and a half, five, etc., therefore in no way belong here. This is contrary to Lücke,[1] and to W. F. Rinck,[2] who[3] wished to represent the entire course of the Apocalypse according to the standard of a great jubilee period, but, in order to introduce the analogy of the seven periods of seven,[4] prior to the great Hallelujah, xix. 1 sqq., is compelled to arrange the most heterogeneous subjects in a series: I. The Seven Epistles. 2. The Seven Seals. 3. The Seven Trumpets. 4. The Seven Vials of Wrath. 5. Babylon upon the Seven Hills and with the Seven Emperors (xvii. 9). 6. The Beast with Seven Heads (xiii., xix.). 7. The Devil as the Dragon with Seven Heads (xii., xx.). Numbers 5–7, however, in no way stand in one line with numbers 1–4.

NOTE 2. — Ewald has recently,[5] in an ingenious way, sought to trace in the Apocalypse a plan founded upon an extremely skilful relation of numbers. His view is as follows: The development of the entire future — viz., not only to the first end, the fall of Rome, and to the two other stages (viz., the destruction of the entire Roman Empire, ch. xix., and of all heathendom, ch. xx.) which also still belong to the beginning of the last divine end, but even up to this, which is the fulfilment in the proper sense — is revealed to the prophet in five series of seven visions each (iv. 1–7, 17; viii. 1–11, 14; xi. 15–xiv. 20; xv. 1–xviii. 24; xix. 1–xxii. 5). Previous to these five series of seven each, there is a sixth series of seven in the seven epistles (chs. ii., iii.); and the whole is, as it were, framed by a seventh series of seven, whose first half (i. 1–20) forms the introduction, and whose second half (xxii. 6–21) the close, of the history and the prophetic writing. The five series of seven visions are constructed according to fixed numerical standards. These present themselves in the simplest way in the first two series of seven. We have here three small groups, viz., two introductory visions (iv. 1–11, v. 1–14, and viii. 1, 2–6), besides three central visions,

[1] p. 407 sqq.

[2] *Apokalyptische Forschungen; oder, Grundriss der Offenb. Joh. u. Anleitung zu ihrem Verständniss.* Zur., 1853.

[3] Cf. already *Herder*, MAPAN AΘA. *Das Buch von der Zukunft des Herrn, des Neuen Testaments Siegel.* Riga, 1779, p. 247 sqq.

[4] "*Wochenjahre*" should be *Jahrwochen*.

[5] *Die Johann. Schriften*, vol. ii. Götting., 1862, p. 38 sq.

showing the real progress of future things (vi. 1-8, *Seals 1-4;* vi. 9-11, *Fifth Seal;* vi. 12-17, *Seal 6;* and viii. 7-13, *Trumpets 1-4;* ix. 1-12, *Fifth Trumpet;* ix. 13-21, *Sixth Trumpet*), and finally two concluding visions (vii. 1-8, 9-17, and x. 1-11, xi. 1-14). In the first of the three chief visions, there are, moreover, always four parts (seals, trumpets): if we enumerate these singly, the result is ten parts for each of the two series of seven. This numerical standard lies at the basis, also, of each of the three other series of seven (xi. 15–xxii. 5), but in such a manner that these three series of seven unite with the two preceding as *one* great series of seven. Taking into consideration the individual series, we find in the series xi. 15–xiv. 20, first, two heavenly introductories (xi. 15–19, xii. 1-17); secondly, three central visions (xii. 18–xiii. 10, xiii. 11-18, xiv. 1-5); and, finally, two supplementary visions (xiv. 6-13. xiv. 14-20). In like manner, in the fourth series, two introductory visions (xv. 1–4, xv. 5–xvi. 1), three central (xvi. 2–9, xvi. 10 sq., xvi. 12–21), and two supplementary (xvii. 1-18, xviii. 1-24); and in the fifth series, two introductory visions (xix. 1-10, 11-16), three central (xix. 17–xx. 6, xx. 7-10, xx. 11-15), two concluding visions (xxi. 1-8, xxi. 9–xxii. 5). We must, however, regard the entire group of the last three series of seven as *one* triple enlarged series of seven. If the question here were chiefly concerning a mere repetition of the scheme lying at the foundation of the two preceding series, the result would be, that just as, by a juncture (*Knotenpunkt*) in the seventh seal, the second series (the trumpets) are connected with the first, so also, by means of a juncture lying in the seventh trumpet, the addition of a seventh simple series of seven (the vials) follows. But for the proportion of prophetic views which are now to be mastered, such a simple form would be too short: it must be trebled. At the same time, therefore, in the expanded form it is indicated, that even if the course of the earthly development proceeds rapidly, and the beginning of the end (the fall of Rome) impends at a brief space, yet the true divine end itself appears as always postponed to a greater distance. Corresponding to this, also, is another expansion of the proportions of the original scheme. For, as we found in the first two of the five series, that in the seven there are at the same time ten sections, so also we can likewise recognize in the third series ten smaller sections, since the first contains the succeeding, or side, visions (xiv. 6-13), and the second, two sections (xiv. 14-20); while the following series is so expanded as to embrace sixteen sections (for the first of the central visions (xvi. 2-9) contains four; the third (xvi. 12-21), two; and the last, — the supplementary vision (xviii. 1-24), — six small sections); and the sixth series extends so far that it likewise comprises seventeen small sections (for the first of the central visions (xix. 17–xx. 6) contains four, and the latter of the two concluding visions, though a small series (xxi. 9–xxii. 5), has seven separate sections).

But such determination of its skilful numerical construction contains one error that is so critical as to unsettle the entire structure. Ewald errs when he

thinks[1] that seventeen sections are to be obtained in the last series of seven: for there are but sixteen; viz., two introductories, four sections contained in the first of the central visions, the two following central visions, the first final vision, and the seven sections comprised in the last final vision. If the sixteen sections thus given be accepted, then the sum of *all* the small sections which should be found in the five series of seven (viz., in the first three series, ten each; in the fourth, sixteen; and in the fifth, as stated, seventeen, but in fact only sixteen) would be, not sixty-three,[2] but only sixty-two; i.e., the sum can be referred no longer to a proportion of seven (9×7); and this means nothing less than that the standard of seven is no longer applicable to what is properly the chief part of the scheme of construction. But if Ewald is to obtain the erroneously received[3] number of seven small sections, he must, as he actually does in his division of the translation, separate the final vision into eight sections; i.e., just in that very part of the work of art which appears to be the crown of all, the standard of distribution into *sevens*, according to which the whole is said to be planned, is laid aside, and exchanged for an entirely different distribution into *eights*.

The entire scheme traced by Ewald in this way only reaches the result that the laws determining the regular art of the composer of the Apocalypse are applied with an arbitrary exaggeration to the very extreme of artificiality. The division and classification of the small sections according to the standard of seven, which Ewald undertakes, in many passages are in no way supported by the text. Why should we, e.g., in the vision of the new Jerusalem, enumerate seven (or eight) small sections, while such visions as chap. xii., chap. xiii. 1–10 (where in vv. 8–10 a discussion of an entirely different character occurs), and chap. xvii., are each regarded as *one* small section? Ewald, moreover, manifestly violates the order and meaning of the text, by connecting the section xi. 15–19 with xii. 1–7, and regarding both as one introductory vision, inserted, according to a regular plan, in the very beginning of a new series of seven. With entire justice, Ewald indeed says that in the last seal and the last trumpet the points of transition for the fuller development are found; but this does not justify the complete separation, in the plan of the book, of the seventh seal and the seven trumpets from the first six, and the insertion of the seventh seal as an introductory vision into the series of trumpets (viii. 1), or the consideration of the final trumpet as only the opening of the following series. The section xi. 15–19 is hereby put in a false light; for this section has just as obviously a definitive signification, already illustrative of the end of things, as the following (xii. 1 sq.) points us forward, by communicating here certain knowledge necessarily presupposed in the understanding of the succeeding visions. In xi. 15–19, we have a real closing vision; in xii. 1 sq., a true introductory vision. It is doubly false when Ewald separates the

[1] p. 47. [2] p. 48. [3] p. 47 sqq.

section xi. 15 sq. from what precedes, and reckons it with what follows. A similar contradiction to the drift of the text occurs, when in chap. vii. Ewald finds the two concluding visions of the first series of seven. What is recorded in chap. vii. has nothing whatever to do with the preceding six seals, but throughout is directed to what is to follow.

Contrary to the text, also, is the distribution proposed by G. Volkmar,[1] which, following Baur, is based essentially upon the hypothesis that the proclamation from a distance, of the judgment of Heaven, contained in the first part (i. 9–ix. 21), is described in the second part (x. 1–xxii. 5) in its earthly fulfilment.

3. The *unity* of this book, and that, too, its original unity, is proved by the methodical organism, in which the entire contents are harmoniously presented from the beginning to the end. The entire Apocalypse is from one fount. A law of formal composition penetrates the whole;[2] a fundamental thought, an essential goal of the entire prophecy everywhere, is likewise prominent.[3] The promises in the seven epistles (chs. ii., iii.) are full of references to the description of the blessed fruition (xxi. 1 sqq.). Their superscriptions mention the Lord of his congregations, not only in the way in which he appears to John from i. 12 on, but also in the same sense wherein he reveals himself in all the visions. The individual parts of the fundamental scene, ch. iv., particular subjects and personal beings, constantly recur in the course of the visions, even to their end: a very marked being, belonging to the so-called second part of the Apocalypse (ch. xii. sqq.), is expressly mentioned already in the first part (xi. 7).

Note. — Grotius was the first to suppose that the visions of the Apocalypse were seen and committed to writing at different times and places. The occasion for this view, which throughout is neither clear nor expressed in consistent connection, he derived from the twofold tradition concerning the place and time of the composition of the Apocalypse. As he found testimony on the one hand that "John received and wrote the revelation at Patmos during the times of the Emperor Claudius," and again, "This happened at Rome under Domitian," he regarded *both* testimonies as correct, and then referred the former statement to what was first, and the latter to what was last, seen.[4] But what the things first and what those last seen are, he has nowhere stated clearly. On xv. 1 he states that all which succeeds happened and was written at Ephesus, but then says that it was during the time of the Emperor Vespasian; and on xvii. 1, xix. 1, remarks, "At another time." That the whole was "reduced to unity" by one hand, Grotius acknowledged, and expressly mentioned the Apostle John as this writer (on iv. 1).

[1] *Comment. zur Off. Joh.*, Zürich, 1862.

[2] Cf. i. 1 with i. 11, iv. 1, xxii. 6.

[3] Cf. i. 7, 8, with iv. 8, vi. 10, x. 7, xi. 17, xxii. 6 sq.

[4] *Annot.* on i. 9.

Vogel[1] sought more through inner criticism to distinguish four parts[2] in the Apocalypse, and to establish different authors; referring to the author of from xii. 1 sq., whom he regards as apparently the presbyter John, the business of editing the whole. Vogel's hypothesis was attacked by Bleek,[3] who in turn expressed the view that the second part of the Apocalypse (ch. xii. sq.) was not written until after the destruction of Jerusalem, while the first part (chs. iv.–xi.) was written *prior* to that event.[4] In support of this, he appealed not only to the dissimilar historico-chronological references in the Apocalypse, but also to the want of connection between chs. xi. and xii., which he attempts to explain by regarding the proper close to be expected after the second woe,[5] which must also have contained the quickly approaching third woe, as cut away and replaced by the now ill-fitting second part. But Bleek has himself expressly withdrawn this opinion.[6]

4. It is only recently that the attempt has been made[7] scientifically to characterize the literary *form* of the Apoc. by a definite technical term, — and that, too, in opposition to Eichhorn,[8] who, as Pareus[9] before him, and Hartwig,[10] wished the Apoc. to be regarded as a dramatic work of art. Eichhorn distinguishes in the proper *drama* (iv. 1–xxii. 5; to which chs. i.–iii. form the prologue, and xxii. 6 sq. the epilogue), *first*, a *prolusio* (prelude) (iv. 1–viii. 5), in which the theatre for the dramatic action is prepared,[11] then three acts as follows: Act I. (viii. 6–xii. 17), Jerusalem is conquered, or Judaism overcome by Christianity. Act II. (xii. 18–xx. 10), Rome is conquered, or heathenism overcome by Christianity. Act III. (xx. 11–xxii. 5), the heavenly Jerusalem descends from heaven, or the blessedness of the future life which is to endure eternally is described. Eichhorn says,[12] that the five chief subjects of history (viz., 1. The destruction of Judaism. 2. The kingdom of Christ in its feebleness arising therefrom. 3. The destruction of heathenism. 4. The kingdom of Christ prevailing on earth arising therefrom. 5. The kingdom of the blessed) would, properly speaking, have required for their presentation five acts, but that as John had but three cities (the earthly

[1] *Commentationes VII. de Apoc. Joann.*, Erlang., 1811–16.

[2] i. 1–8, i. 9–iii. 22, chs. iv.–xi., chs. xii.–xxii.

[3] *Beitrag zur Kritik und Deutung der Offenb. Joh.*, etc., in the Berlin *Theol. Zeitschr.*, vol. ii., 1822, p. 240 sqq.

[4] Cf. chap. xi.

[5] xi. 14.

[6] Cf. *Beiträge zur Evangelien Kritik*, Berl., 1846, p. 81. *Studien u. Kritik.*, 1855, p. 220 sq. *Vorles. über d. Apok., herausgeg. von Th. Hossbach*, Berlin, 1862, p. 116 sqq.

[7] Cf. especially Lücke, p. 374 sqq.

[8] *Comment. in Apoc. Joann.*, Götting., 1791. Cf. also the *Einl. in das N. T.*, vol. ii. 2, Leipz., 1811, of the same author.

[9] l.c., p. 31 sq.: *Drama propheticum seu coeleste.*

[10] *Apologie der Apok. wider falsches Lob und falschen Tadel*, Chenn., 1781 sq., iii. p. 283 sqq.

[11] "*Scena adornatur.*"

[12] *Einl.*, p. 369.

Jerusalem, Rome, the heavenly Jerusalem) which were available as symbols, he had to restrict his drama to three acts. This view of the dramatic nature of the Apoc., Eichhorn bases on the assumption that everywhere in the same there is *action*, and these acts following one another are *seen* in definite places of exhibition.[1] But hereby Eichhorn establishes as his fundamental view, since the entire elaboration into details depends thereon, especially this: viz., that John saw his vision as a drama, but in no way that the *book* composed by the seer in which he gives a report of the *scene* is dramatic; the only question, therefore, is as to what class of writings the Apoc. belongs with respect to its literary character and form. Eichhorn can therefore emphatically assert, as he himself says[2] in self-correction, that the Apoc. is "a description of a seen drama." But even what the Apoc. reports far exceeds the precise artistic form of an actual drama; and as the interpretation of the prophetic contents given by Eichhorn, so also is the designation of the artistic form as dramatic, and the entire distribution into acts, scenes, and exodes, truly frivolous. Hence Eichhorn has found as little approbation for his view, as his predecessors for theirs. Even Heinrichs,[3] who in other respects is entirely dependent upon Eichhorn, controverts[4] it. The correct point in the conception of the Apoc. as a drama lies in this: that the lifelike change of the visional occurrences and language, written in the book, has such clearness as to correspond to the idea of what in artistic form is properly the drama. Hence also, no one can deny that a certain dramatic virtuosity in the artistic form of the Apoc. must be acknowledged; and in so far we may speak of particular scenes, etc., in the book.

Older theologians[5] have regarded the Apoc. as a letter. But the epistolary greeting and wishes found in the introduction (i. 4 sqq) and at the close (xxii. 21) just as little establish the true epistolary character of the entire writing, as, conversely, we could conclude from the absence of such formula, that, e.g., 1 John is not an actual letter, but only a brief discussion.

Lücke styles the literary form of Apoc. "Old Testamental," and that, too, "prophetic," and more definitely "apocalyptic;"[6] particularly, that it follows and resembles the Ezekielian and Danielian form. This statement of Lücke is unsatisfactory in proportion as an answer to the question concerning the artistic form of the Apoc. is expected in terminology derived from unbiblical rhetoric and poetics. Yet just that which is unsatisfactory in the explanation that the literary form of the Apoc. is *apocalyptic*, is instructive and

[1] a. a. O. S., p. 334 sq.

[2] p. 336.

[3] *Apocal. Nov. Test. græce perpetua annotatione illustr.* Ed. Kopplanae, vol. x. pp. 1, 2; Götting., 1818, 1821.

[4] l. c., p. 1; *Proleg.*, p. 84 sq.

[5] Cf. Lücke, p. 376.

[6] p. 377 sq.

not without a good foundation. For the artistic forms by which the works of art of unbiblical rhetoric and poetics are appropriately designated apply to the biblical books only in inexact analogy; since the biblical artistic form, which of course is present, is the organic moulding of matters which in virtue of divine inspiration are fundamentally different from the subjects of all unbiblical artistic language. Eichhorn, who regards every thing presented in the Apoc. as nothing else than pure fictions of a merely poetic genius, could, without any thing further, apply to the artistic work of the Apoc. the canons of classical poetics. But the more thoroughly the fundamental distinction between biblical and classical literature is recognized, must the standard of classical art appear inapplicable. Thus the subject is treated in Lücke, who, as he will not yield in "devotion" to the Apoc., designates its artistic form, not according to classical poetics, but according to its own nature.

Since, however, the Apoc., like the prophetical scriptures of the O. T., as a work composed not without the exercise of human art, has an analogy to the works of art of unbiblical rhetoricians and poets; the literary form of the Apoc. may therefore also be defined by way of analogy, from general literary science. Even Lücke [1] has suggested a comparison between the Apoc., and the poem of Dante which the poet himself called a "comedy," while he celebrates the world to come by the prefix "divine." It is a pity that G. Baur, who has compared the Book of Job with Dante's "Divine Comedy," [2] has taken no occasion to make passing references to the Apoc.; for what he has ingeniously elaborated might in many respects be applied here. If we still had the same terminology of rhetoric and poetics as Dante, we would designate the Apoc. as a sublime form of comedy. For Dante himself declares [3] that he called his poem comedy, since the subject "from the beginning is horrible and repulsive, because it is Hell; and in the end is prosperous, desirable, and pleasing, because it is Paradise." Besides, "the mode of speaking is gentle and humble, — the common talk in which even women converse." In the sense wherein Dante calls his powerful trio "a gentle and humble mode of speaking," viz., because it is the ordinary vernacular (*locutio vulgaris*, etc.), the designation is applicable also to the Apoc.; so likewise as to the subject of the book, the development through the terrors of the plagues and the judgment of wrath, to the eternal peace of the new Jerusalem. Accordingly the Apoc. is in the sense of Dante, as to contents and form, a real (divine) comedy.[4] But if modern poetics more correctly ascribes the poem of Dante, relating what he saw in hell, purgatory, and

[1] p. 391.

[2] *Stud. u. Kritik.*, 1856, 3, p. 586 sq.

[3] Quoted by Baur, a. a. O. S., 618.

[4] Thus even Joh. Gerhard designates the history of Christ's suffering as a comedy in five acts, because from a wonderfully brilliant

paradise, to the epic class, in like manner may the artistic form of the Apoc. be designated as epic; a character which is not impaired by particular lyrical parts of the book,[1] but only heightened thereby, since, according to De Wette's excellent remark, "the parts exhibit in a well-executed way the great idea of the divine peace" They form the pauses in the epic course and movement of the whole.

An unfavorable estimate of the Apoc. as a work of art has been made by E. Reuss.[2]

SEC. II. — THE FUNDAMENTAL THOUGHT, THE PARACLETIC TENDENCY, THE PROPHETIC — ESPECIALLY THE APOCALYPTIC — CHARACTER, OF THE BOOK.

1. The more difficult the understanding of the Apoc. appears, and in many respects actually is both as a whole and in detail, the more necessary is it to obtain from the writing itself, with the utmost clearness and definiteness, the fundamental thoughts sustaining and conditioning the whole and the details in contents and form. These fundamental thoughts John has himself traced with such strong, broad lines, that they are visible even in the most intricate parts of the entire description. In this way, the prophet has himself given for the exposition of his book, not only the most inviolable norm, but also the most correct key, so that the hope for an agreement and essential harmony between the interpreters who cross and contradict one another, is based upon the extent that agreement in the recognition of the fundamental thought is possible.

If, according to i. 1, iv. 1, xxii. 6, John beheld *ἃ δεῖ γενέσθαι* (*ἐν τάχει*) "the things which must come to pass (shortly)," which therefore forms the subject of the prophecy contained in his writing, such varied contents seem thereby indicated, that a fixed fundamental thought reducing all the particulars to unity apparently cannot possibly be present. This impossibility has been maintained by numerous expositors, who, as, e.g., Nicolaus de Lyra, have found the particular facts of ecclesiastical and secular history prophesied, by treating the Apoc. as, e.g., Aretius[3] declares: "If you look well into this book, you will see the fortune of the whole Church portrayed as on a

beginning a blessed and joyful result follows; viz., the resurrection. To the Pharisees, etc., Christ's suffering was a tragedy. Cf. *Erklärung der Historie des Leiden und Sterbens unsers Herrn Christi Jesu*, Berlin, ed. 1868, p. ii.

[1] The hymns, etc.

[2] *Gesch. der heil. Schrift. N.T.*, Braunschw., 1860, p. 146. On the artistic ideas of the Apoc., cf. F. Piper, *Einleit. in die Monumentale Theologie*, Gotha, 1867, p. 17 sqq.

[3] *Comment. in omnes Epistolas — itemque in Apoc. Joann.*, Morg., 1583.

tablet."[1] From this standpoint,[2] from which no fixed fundamental thought running through all the details can in any way be seen, there has been devised the art of allegorical exposition, from which alone the entire fulness of the most special predictions was to be derived. Hence, even to Hengstenberg, Ebrard, Auberlen,[3] etc., allegorizing is a necessity, because even these expositors, although to them the fundamental thought of the Apoc. is not so hidden as to the older expositors, yet misunderstand its true relation to the individual members of the entire prophecy, and likewise find in the Apoc. a proportion of particular predictions concerning which it is not amiss to say that the modern allegorists wish to regard the particular events[4] foretold, not in the light of *ecclesiastical* or secular history, but in that of the history of *empires*, and hence that their mode of exposition should be designated the *imperial*-historical.[5] But the entire mass of future things (*ἃ δεῖ γενέσθαι*), apparently lacking a fixed limitation and organic unity, not only receives by the addition *ἐν τάχει* (shortly)[6] a more specific determination, but it is also undeniable that the entire prophecy tends towards a definite and more than once expressly designated goal. To this must be added the undoubted relationship between the Apoc. and the eschatological discourses of our Lord, especially Matt. xxiv., and the analogy of N. T. prophecy in general. As now the Lord himself presents his personal return as the fixed goal for the hopes of believers, and this his *parousia* forms the fundamental thought of all his prophetic discourses unto the end;[7] as, in the hour of his ascension, the two angels[8] proclaimed to the disciples the Lord's return; and as the deepest and most essential feature of the entire hope and prophecy of the N. T. pertains to this personal *parousia* of the Lord, and all other eschatological questions, as, e.g., resurrection, judgment, etc., depend upon this centre,[9] — so also the entire prophecy of the Apoc. rests upon the fundamental thought of the *personal return of the Lord*. As the proper theme of the entire book, this prophetic fundamental thought is explicitly announced from the very beginning;[10] and where in the epilogue the deepest relation of the entire revelation is once more summarily presented, there it is re-

[1] *Si probe inspicias hunc librum, videbis quasi in tabella depictam fortunam totius ecclesiae* (on i. 9).

[2] A formal synopsis of Church history, applied to Apocalyptic prophecy, was written by Joh. Jonston (*Hist. civ. et eccles. ab orbe cond. ad a. 1633*, Francof. 1678. Secular history he gave according to Daniel.

[3] *Der Prophet Daniel und die Offenb. Joh.*, 2d ed. Basle, 1857.

[4] e.g., the migration of nations, the German Empire, etc.

[5] See below, note to paragraph 3.

[6] Cf. i. 3: *ὁ γὰρ καιρὸς ἐγγύς*, "for the time is at hand."

[7] Cf. Matt. xxiv. sq., xxvi. 29, 64; Luke xii. 40; John v. 26 sqq.

[8] Acts i. 11.

[9] Cf. 1 Pet. iv. 5; 1 Cor. i. 7 sq., xv. 22 sq.; 1 Thess. iv. 14 sq.; 1 John ii. 28.

[10] i. 3.

peated in the words ἔρχομαι ταχύ ("I come quickly"),[1] as also then, on the other hand, the entire answer of all believers to the divine revelation given in the prophetical book is compressed into one word expressing the longing for the Lord's return: ἔρχου ("come").[2]

NOTE. — Kliefoth's exception (on i. 7), that the prophecy refers to the preparations for the *parousia* and its effects, and hence that the *parousia* itself cannot be designated as the fundamental thought, seems to me entirely inapplicable, because, in connection with those very preparations and effects, the main question is concerning the *parousia* itself. Hilgenf. correctly recognizes the goal of prophecy, but incorrectly, and without foundation in the text, determines the goal of the *parousia* to be "the erection of an earthly kingdom of the Messiah." Even the thousand years reign of the Apoc. is not purely earthly. The error in Hilgenf. concurs with two other misunderstandings prevalent in Baur's school, — that the account of *Nero redivivus* is the key to the Apoc.; and that the book is an expression of a decided anti-Pauline Judaeo-Christianity. But in the last respect Hilgenf. does not go as far as Volkmar.

If the prophet thus himself presents the leading fundamental thought of his entire prophecy, it is scarcely necessary yet to indicate the particular passages in which this fixed basis becomes manifest. All the prophecies and threats which the Lord causes to be written to the seven churches presuppose that he will come.[3] The entire manifestation of the Lord,[4] his designation as ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἔσχατος ("the first and the last"), is the pledge of his coming to judgment, which also is indicated in this: that God is called, already in the introductory greeting,[5] and in the divine declaration[6] sealing the principal theme[7] whose announcement precedes, ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος ("which is, and which was, and which is to come").[8] The definite relation of the entire prophecy to the future coming of the Lord is also established in the very beginning, where the revelation properly speaking begins, — viz., at the opening of the first seal,[9] — by the fact that the very first form which John beholds is the Lord himself going forth to victory; and again at the close, it is the Lord himself who goes forth from heaven to subdue his enemies.[10]

2. From this fundamental thought of the personal return of the Lord, whose further elaboration is to be more minutely traced under No. 3, pro-

[1] xxii. 7, 12, 20.
[2] xxii. 17, 20.
[3] Cf. especially ii. 16, iii. 311, 20.
[4] i. 12 sq.
[5] i. 4.
[6] i. 8.
[7] i. 7, ἐθχέται ("Behold, he cometh").
[8] iv. 8; cf. also xi. 17, where the ὁ ἐρχόμενος is lacking because the coming is there celebrated, although proleptically as having already occurred.
[9] vi. 2.
[10] xix. 11 sq.

ceeds the paracletic force and purpose of the Apoc. A delicate sense of this peculiar paracletic office of the Apoc. is expressed in several ecclesiastical statements concerning the use of the book in divine worship. Already in the so-called *Comes*, a pericope taken from the Apoc.[1] is in addition to Matt. ii. 13 sq. appointed for the festival of Holy Innocents, as the first martyrs for Christ,[2] and is retained by the Catholic, the Anglican, and other evangelical churches [3] Still more characteristic is the ordinance of the fourth Synod of Toledo, in the year 633, that the Apoc. should be read between Easter and Whitsun-day; an arrangement which is still in force.[4] The entire Pentecostal season in its joyful character resembled Sunday; and therefore fasting and praying on bended knees occurred as rarely then as on the Lord's Days.[5] For not only when a Church festival is to celebrate the eternal glory of the martyrs of Jesus Christ, and divine vengeance upon their murderers, does the Apoc. have a judicial tone;[6] but as it was itself given to the seer on a Lord's Day,[7] so also upon it rests the sanction of this Christian day of peace and joy, and it becomes the text-book for every Sunday of the entire Pentecost. From the very nature of the case, the paracletic element in the Apoc. is presented not so much in the great series of visions, iv. 1–xxii. 5, as rather in the introductory part (chs. i.–iii.) and the close (xxii. 6 sqq.); but while here the paracletic force of the prophetic fundamental thought is expressly and intentionally unfolded and applied, yet this makes itself perceptible also in what is, properly speaking, the main part of the book. When the prophet at the very beginning addresses his brethren as "*a companion in tribulation and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ*," [8] he expressly renders the paracletic contents of his prophecy prominent. This prophetic consolation appears formally elaborated in the seven epistles (chs ii., iii.), whose admonitions, reproofs, warnings, threats, and promises all proceed from the fundamental thought of the impending coming of the Lord. In the θλῖψις (tribulation) [9] sure to happen, and even already present, which Satan in his exasperation excites through the dwellers upon earth,

[1] xiv. 1 sq.

[2] Cf. E. Ranke, *Das kirchl. Perikopensystem*, Berl. 1847. *Appendix Monum.* p. lv.

[3] Cf. Daniel, *Codex Liturg. eccl. Luth.*, Lip. 1848. Tab. I. A.

[4] Cf. Lücke, p. 640 sq.

[5] Cf. the fragment from the writings of Irenaeus concerning the passover: τ. πεντακοστῆς ἐν ᾗ οὐ κλίνομεν γόνυ, ἐπειδὴ ἰσοδυναμεῖ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς κυριακῆς, "on Pentecost at which we do not bend the knee, since it has the same force as the Lord's Day." Opp. ed. Stieren., T. I., Leipz., 1853, p. 829. Cf. Justini, Opp. ed. Otto. T. III. p. 2, Jen., 1850, p. 180. Tertullian, *De cor. mil.*, c. 3: "On the Lord's Day, fasting or to adore with bended knees we regard sacrilege. We rejoice in the same privilege from Easter to Pentecost."

[6] Cf. xix. 2, and similar passages.

[7] i. 10.

[8] i. 9.

[9] ii. 9, iii. 10.

Jews and heathen, and will continue to excite with ever-increasing rage against believers,[1] they are with patience[2] and watchful fidelity to persevere unto the end, to firmly maintain the words and commandments of their heavenly Lord, not to deny his name,[3] to be faithful even to the end;[4] because they know, and are assured most confidently by the present prophecy, that the Lord, who is the King of all kings,[5] and the victor over all enemies both of himself and his people,[6] and who by redemption has made his people also kings,[7] will in the end personally return, to execute just vengeance upon all enemies,[8] and after their conflicts and victories to reward his faithful servants.[9] John, therefore, has good reason for so urgently commending to readers[10] his prophetic book, which in its most essential fundamental thoughts brings with it such important comfort.

3. What has thus been said concerning the fundamental thoughts pervading the entire Apoc., and the consolation derived therefrom, may be claimed to be recognized by every impartial expositor. For even though, in an individual passage cited, the particular exposition may be urged as contradictory, yet the result, as a whole, abides sure, since what has been said concerning the Apoc. stands as though written on its very front; and if, to mention some great name, EICHHORN states the fundamental thoughts of the book otherwise, he thereby testifies, not to the ambiguity of the subject, but only to his own rationalistic prejudice. We enter, however, a battle-field, when we proceed to more accurately state the concrete elaboration, in the Apoc., of the fundamental thought of the Lord's personal return. In this lies the special *apocalyptic* character of the *prophetical* book; here is the special source of the controversy concerning the Apoc., with respect to criticism as well as exegesis. John himself expressly entitles his book *prophetic*;[11] as he writes, he employs a true προφητεύειν (*prophesying*).[12] He himself also indicates with what right his book can claim true prophetic authority, so that it is essentially on the same level with the Holy Scriptures of the O. T. prophets, as John also teaches nothing else than that the contents of his prophecy agree with those of the O. T.[13] According to the biblical, and that, too, not merely the O. T. fundamental view, a prophet is one in whose mouth God puts his words, through whom God himself speaks

[1] Cf. xii. 12, 17, xx. 7 sqq.
[2] i. 9, iii. 10, xiii. 10, xvi. 15.
[3] iii. 8, 10, xxii. 7, 14.
[4] ii. 10; cf. vi. 10 sq.
[5] xix. 16.
[6] Cf. vi. 2, xiv. 1 sqq., xix. 11 sqq.
[7] i. 6, v. 9.
[8] vi. 10, viii. 3 sqq., xi. 18, xiii. 10, xix. 2.
[9] Cf. all the closing promises in the Epistles, chs. ii. 3, vii. 13 sqq., xi. 18, xxii. 12, etc.
[10] i. 3, xxii. 18 sq.
[11] i. 3: τ. λόγους τῆς προφητείας, "the words of this prophecy." Cf. xxii. 7, 10, 18, 19: τ. λόγ. τῆς προφητείας τοῦ βιβλίου τούτου, "the sayings of the prophecy of this book."
[12] Cf. x. 11.
[13] Cf. x. 7.

in revelation, an interpreter, as it were the mouth of God.[1] This conception of the prophetic character, corresponding to the biblical conception of God, is that in which the Apoc. presents itself most definitely and expressly. For, what he writes in the book, John has not derived from himself: he is only the witness,[2] who, in obedience to a divine command, according to an express divine call, writes what has been divinely presented to his view,—what has been first on God's part revealed to him. This John urges repeatedly in attestation of the truly prophetic character of his book,[3] and it is also expressed in the entire plan of the Apoc. For what are here proclaimed are future things (*ἃ δεῖ γενέσθαι*) which have been previously ordained by the eternal, all-governing God, the Alpha and the Omega, just judgments, ways and works of his holiness, might, and glory, which, on the one hand, must of course come to pass, because he is the Alpha and the Omega,[4] but, on the other hand, are also a divine mystery[5] enclosed in the seven-times sealed book.[6] But, as when God in former times revealed his mystery to the ancient prophets, he proclaimed the final glorious goal of his mystery in a joyful message,[7] so also God gave to John a revelation[8] concerning future things, which he was himself to prophetically proclaim, by opening the seals of the book of fate[9] before the gaze of the prophet who sees in the spirit,[10] and furnishing him with the true gift of "prophesying."[11] Still more definitely marked is this relation between the apocalypse of the divine mystery, and the prophesying of John dependent thereon,[12] in that not only the form of the Apoc, the *vision*, but as its personal communicator, first of all Christ himself, and afterwards an angel, is introduced.[13] With respect to the vision as the form of the revelation and the mediating service of angels, John stands in a parallel with the later prophets of the O. T., especially with Zechariah and Daniel, the book of the latter being even sometimes called the O. T. Apocalypse; and also, in the mode of imparting the revelation through Christ, there is no essential distinction between John

[1] Cf. Exod. iv. 15 sq., with vii. 1; Deut. xviii. 18; John xi. 51; 1 Pet. i. 10 sq.; 2 Pet. i. 21.

[2] i. 2.

[3] i. 1 sqq., xxii. 6 sq.; cf. iv. 1, x. 8 sqq., xiv. 13, xix. 9 sq., xxi. 5 sq., 9, xxii. 1.

[4] i. 8; cf. xi. 15 sqq., xix. 1 sqq.

[5] Cf. x. 7.

[6] v. 1 sqq.

[7] x. 7: *τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ θεοῦ ὡς εὐηγγέλισε —τοὺς προφήτας*, "the *mystery* as he hath promised the *glad tidings* to the prophets." Note the correlative conceptions.

[8] *ἀποκάλύψις*, i. 1. Cf. Dan. ii. 19: *τῷ Δαν. ἐν ὁράματι τῆς νυκτὸς τὸ μυστήριον ἀπεκαλύφθη*, "The secret was revealed to Daniel in a night vision." Dan. ii. 22: *ἀντὸς ἀποκαλύπτει βαθέα καὶ ἀπόκρυφα*, "He revealeth the deep and secret things."

[9] vi. 1 sqq.

[10] i. 10, iv. 1 sqq.

[11] x. 8 sq.

[12] Cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 29 sq: *Προφηται δὲ δὺο ἢ τρεῖς λαλείτωσαν —ἐὰν δὲ ἄλλῳ ἀποκάλυφθῇ κ.τ.λ.*: "Let the prophets speak, two or three . . . if any thing be *revealed* to another."

[13] i. 1, 12 sqq., vi. 1 sqq., x. 1 sqq., xvii. 1 sqq., xxi. 9, xxii. 1, 6 sqq.

and the ancient prophets. For, as they already pointed to Christ as the proper goal of their prophecy,[1] so from the N. T. standpoint we must judge also that the Spirit of Christ wrought in them that revelation from which their prophecy proceeded.[2] In the fullest and clearest way, this is applicable to the Christian prophets, whose fellowship of faith with Christ[3] is the first fundamental pre-supposition for the reception of revelation. On a Lord's Day, it is made to John.[4] Christ himself appears to the prophet, and sends him as his servant[5] to his congregations to which he himself, as the Lord and Saviour, will make this revelation.[6] Christ himself opens the seals of the book of fate, whose contents refer, even in that which essentially pertains to himself, to his return.

Accordingly, in calling his writing an *ἀποκάλυψις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*,[7] John does not mean to indicate what we have in mind when we apply to it the technical term *apocalyptic*. There the word *ἀποκάλυψις* has no special emphatic sense;[8] and it is undoubtedly an exegetical error when it is taken in the sense of *παρουσία, ἐπιφάνεια*, and the genitive Ἰησ. Χρ. as an objective genitive.[9] John expresses nothing else than the prophetic character of his book, when he refers its *mysterious* contents to the revelation given him through Christ[10] The word *ἀποκάλυψις*, as a technical designation of a particular species of prophetical books, is entirely foreign to all scriptural usage. In the O. T., the noun *ἀποκάλυψις* occurs in the corresponding verb *ἀποκαλύπτειν*,[11] but not in a religious sense; yet, even in its general sense, it appears as a correlative of *μυστήριον*.[12] In the sense of the N. T., it is also impossible to speak of an *ἀποκάλυψις Ἰωάννου*, as the oldest title of our book reads; yet even in the N. T., already, occasion is given for the later application of the technical expression. Paul presents *ἀποκάλυψις* as a special kind of divine operation alongside of *προφητεία, διδαχή, γλῶσσα* (*prophecy, doctrine, tongues*), etc.;[13] and just that which forms the fundamental thought in the prophetic book of John, is called in the apostolic writings the *ἀποκάλυψις τοῦ κυρίου*.[14] Thus it occurred, that the book treating of that impending revelation, i. e., of the

[1] Acts x. 43; cf. Rev. x. 17.

[2] 1 Pet. i. 11; cf. Rev. xix. 10.

[3] i. 1: *τῷ δούλῳ αὐτοῦ Ἰωάννῃ*, "to his servant John." Cf. i. 5: *ἀγ. ἡμᾶς*, "hath washed us;" v. 9: *συγκοιν. ἐν τ. θλ. κ. βασιλείᾳ κ. ὑπομονῇ ἐν Ἰησ.*, "companion in tribulation and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ."

[4] i. 10.

[5] Cf. i. 1.

[6] i. 11 sqq.

[7] i. 1.

[8] Against Auberlen, a. a. O. S., 81.

[9] Cf. 2 Thess. i. 7; 1 Cor. i. 7; 1 Pet. i. 7, 13, iv. 13. Against Heinr., Lücke also (p. 23) is not clear.

[10] Cf. Eph. iii. 3; Gal. i. 12.

[11] Dan. ii. 19 sq.

[12] Sir. xxii. 22; cf. xli. 23, xi. 27. A very special use of the term is presented in 1 Kings xx. 30.

[13] 1 Cor. xiv. 6, 26.

[14] 2 Thess. i. 7; 1 Cor. i. 7; 1 Pet. i. 7, 13.

coming of the Lord, which is itself called an *ἀποκάλυψις Ἰησοῦ Χρ.*, i. e., a revelation communicated by the Lord himself, is designated absolutely by the title *ἀποκάλυψις*, to which then the name of the writer could be attached. Thus then originated the title *Ἀποκάλυψις Ἰωάννου*, in no way corresponding to John's meaning; and, in conformity with this ecclesiastical use of the term, the pseudo-John, who wrote an apocryphal Apocalypse, was able to employ it, when, without reflecting upon his bungling work, he fixed his title: *Ἀποκάλυψις τοῦ ἁγίου ἀποστόλου καὶ εὐαγγελίστου Ἰωάννου τοῦ θεολόγου.*[1] As a literary, technical expression, Justin[2] does not yet use the term *ἀποκάλυψις*; but the fragment of Muratori already speaks of an Apoc. of Peter beside one of John; and Irenaeus quotes with the formula: "John in the Apoc. says,"[3] although he still can speak of "*beholding*" the revelation.[4] The adoption of the word *ἀποκάλυψις* as a technical literary expression is analogous with the use of *εὐαγγέλιον*, whereby in the N. T. confessedly nothing less is designated than a book, as, e. g., we speak of a "Gospel of Matthew," etc.; but the ancient traditional titles[5] correspond much more to the original meaning, than does the title *ἀποκ. Ἰωάννου.*

But when the question is concerning the comprehensive statement of the special *apocalyptical* character of biblical prophecy, it must be manifestly unhistorical and unjust to proceed from apocryphal apocalyptical literature, by including with the Jewish products of that class the canonical Book of Daniel as the O. T. Apocalypse,[6] and with the Christian writings of that class the canonical Apoc. of John, and thus for writings of a different character seeking the same so-called apocalyptic standard. Even Lücke[7] proceeds essentially in this way. More correct is Auberlen's[8] view, above all things, to establish the pure conception of *biblical* apocalyptics; but he proceeds from Daniel, and according to that attempts to determine both what is the same and what is different in the N. T. Apocalypse. But the history of the origin of the idea of apocalyptics itself points in the opposite direction. It is from the Johannean Apoc. that the name and idea of what is apocalyptic originate, and have been transferred to the Book of Daniel and the entire apocryphal apocalyptic literature which stands in most obvious dependence upon these two apocalypses in the canon. That is called apoca-

[1] ("Apocalypse of the holy apostle and evangelist, John, the divine.")

[2] *ἐν ἀποκαλύψει γενομένῃ αὐτῷ — προεφήτευσε* ("prophesied by a revelation made to him"), *c. Trypho*, ch. 81.

[3] C. Haer., iv. 14, 18. Ed. Stieren, pp. 600, 619.

[4] l.c., v. 30, p. 803.

[5] *εὐαγγ. κατὰ M.* (Gospel *according to* M.)

[6] Cf. Hilgenfeld: *Die judische Apocalyptik in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwickelung*, Jena, 1857.

[7] a. a. O. S., 34 sqq.

[8] p. 79 sq.

lyptic which appears to be like the book which designates itself as an ἀποκάλυψις Ἰησοῦ Χρ. : the Johannean Apoc. is, therefore, the norm according to which the conception of what is apocalyptic, both within and without the canon, must be determined.

NOTE. — It is instructive first to compare this with definitions found in another way. LÜCKE, who properly, and in conformity with the fundamental thought of the Johannean Apoc., emphasizes the eschatological element in the Apoc. prophecy,[1] reckons further among its characteristics the circle of visions pertaining to universal history, the combination of prophecy and history, and that, too, of the past and present not less than the future: to which it is besides added, not only that it is not always clearly seen what is actually past, present, or future to the Apoc. prophets, and that in a pseudepigraphic way the entire prophecy was ascribed to some ancient men (as Enoch, Moses, Daniel, etc.), but also, that, even according to the ideal truth of the symbol, there are actual and even chronological particulars prophesied; as, e. g., the symbol appears as the peculiar form of representation, corresponding to the vision as the prevalent form of revelation. On the other hand, Hilgenfeld justly observes that this entire definition lacks unity in the determination of principles, and that the Johannean Apoc. is neither universal-historical nor pseudepigraphical. It is his purpose[2] to characterize only the Judaic apocalyptics. What he indicates concerning the nature of apocalyptics in general, he does not expressly apply to the Johannean Apoc.; yet his opinion in this respect also can, to an extent, be discerned. Apocalyptics, he says, presupposes the conclusion of the ancient, national prophecy: it is a sequel and imitation of the latter. From ancient prophecy, it derives the form, the prophetic garb (so that the pseudepigraphic mode of composition becomes almost a necessity), and also the most essential contents; only with the distinction, that "the subject is no longer, as before, concerning the transient contact of Judaism with a great heathen power, but rather concerning its relation to an eventful and manifold worldly dominion passing from one heathen nation to another." Jewish apocalyptics attempts to answer the question "how and when the dominion of the world, possessed so long by heathen nations, will finally be delivered to the people of God."[3] According to Hilgenfeld's view, therefore, what is *apocalyptic* is not truly *prophetic;* the canonical prototype of Daniel, and the apocryphal imitations, he places in the same category; both kinds of apoc. writings are only copies of the national prophecy. According to this, an essentially apocalyptic element, belonging also to the true prophets, cannot be affirmed.[4] But even what has been said concerning the apocalyptic fundamental thoughts is incorrect. Daniel

[1] "The eschatological Apoc. has chiefly to do with the future of the divine kingdom" (p. 34).

[2] a. a. O. S., 10 sqq.

[3] p. 11 sq.

[4] Cf. x. 7.

does not prophesy the transition of the dominion of the world from the heathen to the people of God; and just as inapplicable is this to the Johannean Apocalypse.

In opposition to Lücke, as well as to Hilgenfeld, stands Auberlen. He also regards apocalyptics chiefly with reference to the silence of prophecy in general; but he does not, like Hilgenfeld, make apocalyptics an imitation of ancient prophecy developed from times wherein there was no revelation. But with him apocalyptics is regarded as the very highest summit of true prophecy: "the Apocalypses are to serve the Church of God as prophetic lights for the times without revelation, in which the Church has been given over to the hands of the Gentiles."[1] The O. T. time of the Gentiles is the post-exilic period; for this, the Book of Daniel is intended. The N. T. time of the Gentiles is that of Church history, the entire period until the end of days; for this, the Johannean Apoc. has been given. Thus it becomes accountable how each testament has but *one* Apoc. Connected with this, however, are the facts, that not only the apocryphal imitations of prophecy appearing in the times destitute of revelation, chiefly took the Apocalypses as models,[2] but also that criticism and exegesis, in the absence of spiritual understanding, can most easily do injustice to the Apocalypses as the most wonderful products of the Spirit of revelation. As to the peculiar character of the Apocalypses, the result of their special application to the times of the Gentiles without revelation, is that they are, on the one hand, more universal in their sweep, and, on the other, more special in their description of details,[3] than other prophecy.[4] What Auberlen[5] says concerning the distinction between the O. T. and the N. T. Apocalyptics, does not allude to the nature of the conception. More important is the chapter on "The Nature of Apocalyptics," in which the dream and vision are explained as its *subjective*, and symbolism as its *objective* form.[6] The prophet, says Auberlen, *speaks* only in the Spirit;[7] but the apocalyptist *is* in the Spirit.[8] "Here, therefore, where the object is not so much an immediate influence upon contemporaries, but a communication to all coming generations, man is alone with God revealing himself, and perceives only that which has been disclosed to him from above." But the form of symbolism[9] shows in the Apocalypses, which have to do especially with the second appearing of Christ for judging, "how

[1] καιροὶ ἐθνῶν, Luke xxi. 24.

[2] "The times without revelation, which nevertheless retained the influence of its still fresh impression, in their efforts of imitation naturally preferred the more to turn to that part of sacred literature which had revelation for its subject, as here the most wonderful and exalted form of the then painfully missed revelation was found."

[3] i.e., in foretelling particular facts, even in secular history, and chronological determination.

[4] a. a. O. S., pp. 79–85.

[5] pp. 85–89. [6] pp. 89–101.

[7] 1 Cor. xii. 3. [8] Rev. i. 10, iv. 2.

[9] Which, besides disclosing to the wise, at the same time is intended for a relative veiling, so that even to the wise its true significance is offered only gradually in its progressive fulfilment (p. 95).

every thing natural must die, in order that the glory of the essential spiritual life may emerge."[1]

This entire discussion of Auberlen rests upon a conception of inspiration and prophecy which seems to us as unbiblical as the criticism and exegesis conditioned thereby are erroneous; yet our exceptions here concern only particulars. 1. It is neither correct to say that the distinction between ordinary and apocalyptic prophecy lies in this, that the apocalyptist *is* in the Spirit, and the prophet *speaks* in the Spirit, nor that the apocalyptic form of revelation is the most wonderful and exalted. All prophets can speak in the Spirit, only by being in the Spirit: John, therefore, testifies concerning himself,[2] not that he is an apocalyptist as one being in the Spirit, but that he is a prophet like all the rest. The particular form of revelation, viz., the ecstatic vision and the dream, is not the summit, but only the lowest grade, of divine revelation:[3] in like manner, the symbolical form also of prophetic discourse is inferior to the non-symbolical; and that symbolism does not essentially belong to apocalyptics, follows not only from the fact that prophetic discourses of an apocalyptic form occur without the symbolical form, — above all others, the apocalyptic discourses of the Lord himself, — but also that there are symbolical discourses which are not of an apocalyptic nature. 2. Closely connected with this, is what Auberlen says concerning the peculiar contents of apocalyptic prophecy, and its designation more for all coming generations than for a circle present to the prophet. No doubt, if it were the office of apocalyptics to foretell by a universal survey, and at the same time by the special portrayal of details, the facts and chronological relations of the history of the world, the church, or empires, such prophecy would have weight only with coming generations, and would gradually become intelligible by its gradual fulfilment. But John writes his Apocalypse for a definite circle of churches, with the express purpose to edify not all coming generations, but the contemporary congregations; and, on the other hand, it is to be emphatically denied that the Johannean Apocalypse intends to give either a universal or a special survey of history until the coming of Christ. The mode of exposition advanced by Auberlen can derive either from the text, only by the most arbitrary allegorizing. The pretended designation for all coming generations presupposes that the seven churches must be understood, in some sense or other, allegorically, — and even the geographical names of the cities have been allegorically interpreted, — yet these universal or special predictions, in the sense of Auberlen and many ancient and modern expositors, are to be obtained only by interpreting allegorically the visions, which in no respect indicate their allegorical character, and by accommodating the historical circle of visions of the prophet, and the consequent definiteness and limitation of prophecy, by an allegorizing violation of the context. The former occurs especially in the accounts of the seals and trumpets; the latter, in the following chapters.

[1] p. 97. [2] i. 10; cf. i. 1 sqq. [3] Num. xii. 6 sqq.; cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 2 sqq.

Just as certainly as the conception and name of what is apocalyptic are derived from the Johannean Apocalypse (which professes to be nothing else than a prophetical book), with historical justice is only that to be regarded prophetical and apocalyptic which is peculiar to this book, and yet has essential similarity with the prophetical writings of the Old Testament; viz , the fundamental thought of the personal return of Christ, and the consequent glorious and eternal fruition of the kingdom of God. This apocalyptic prophecy, on the one hand, can grow in its fullest and purest form, only from New-Testament soil, since the actual manifestation of God in the flesh, and the completion of the work of redemption, constitute of themselves the actual pledge of his final manifestation for judgment, and the eternal fruition of his kingdom;[1] and, on this account, the prophetic discourses of the Son of man himself are in a model way apocalyptic,[2] and all the New-Testament Scriptures are no less permeated by apocalyptic prophetic thoughts.[3] But on the other side, as Rev x. 7 profoundly indicates, the apocalyptic element is native to even Old-Testament prophecy. The *protevangelium* (Gen. iii. 15) already contains the living germ of the entire biblical apocalyptics; but just in the proportion as, in the development of Old-Testament prophecy, the image of the Redeemer to come in the flesh is the more clearly presented, is the apocalyptic prophecy of the eternal fruition of his work and kingdom the more definitely expressed. This is true, even though the apocalyptic predictions of those ancient prophets, since the first appearing of the Son of man had not yet occurred, with moral necessity bear the limitation of not distinguishing with New-Testament clearness between the first and second coming of Christ.

But this essential apocalyptic prophecy receives a more definite form by the relation in which the coming of Christ, and the fruition of his kingdom, are placed to the antichristian powers. This reference in general is, according to the nature of the subject, necessary, because the coming of Christ cannot be thought of[4] without his work of judgment, by which the victorious[5] fruition of his kingdom is conditioned: but, in biblical apocalyptics, this reference to the anti-theocratic and antichristian powers appears also in more concrete embodiment, and that, too, in such a way that this reference, as well in Old-Testament as in New-Testament apocalyptics, is to forms of

[1] Cf. Rev. i. 5, 18, iii. 21, v. 5, 9 sq.

[2] Cf. Matt. xxiv. sq., vii. 22 sq.; John vi. 39 sq.

[3] Rom. viii. 20 sqq., xiii. 11; 1 Cor. iii. 13, v. 5, xv. 54 sqq.; Phil. ii. 9 sqq., iii. 20 sq.; Tit. ii. 13; Heb. i. 10 sqq., iv. 9 sqq. Cf. especially all the testimonies concerning Christian hope.

[4] Cf., as an example for this common characteristic of all apocalyptic prophecy, Ps cx. 1 sqq.; Isa. xi. 4 sqq., lxvi. 24; Matt. vii. 22, xxv. 31 sqq.; 1 Cor. xv. 25 sq.

[5] Cf. Rev. vi. 2, xix. 11 sqq.

ungodly world-powers historically presented; but in this, not only does New-Testament prophecy in general have peculiar pre-eminence above that of the Old Testament, but, even within the New Testament, the apocalyptic prophecy of the Lord — as that which is truly complete — has pre-eminence above that of John. In Daniel's view, the anti-theocratic world-power is concentrated in Antiochus Epiphanes: on him and his blasphemous reign, therefore, according to Daniel's Apocalypse, the final judgment comes.[1] When the Lord himself speaks of his return to judgment, he applies the threat in his apocalyptics to Jerusalem and the Jewish nation, which had rejected him. He does not say, however, that the destruction of Jerusalem will be contemporaneous with the actual end of the world, and that immediately after that event his kingdom will be completely established; but he renders prominent the real connection between that particular historical act of judgment and the final judgment of the world. He expresses the eschatological import, which the treading-down of the Holy City by the Gentiles has, more than any other event of history, to the *parousia*. In the Johannean Apocalypse, we find what is similar, although not precisely identical. On the one hand, John's historical horizon is so extended as to embrace not only antichristian Judaism, but also antichristian heathenism, which, in the form of Rome drunk with the blood of the Christian martyrs, stands before the eyes of the prophet. But, on the other hand, John's apocalyptic prophecy[2] intentionally and completely discloses the demoniacal foundation of what is of antichrist among the inhabitants of the earth, so that also the judgment upon those demoniacal powers forms an especially important subject of prophecy. The synagogue of Satan are the Jews, who with blasphemy and deeds of violence prepare for believers the Lord's tribulation;[3] and in Jerusalem, where Christ was crucified, his two witnesses will be killed by the beast from the abyss:[4] but the Roman secular power,

[1] If we suppose that in Dan. vii. 26 (ii. 34 sq., 44 sq., vii. 9–14), the judgment of Rev. xix. 11–21 (Matt. xxiv. 29 sqq.) is described in distinction from that of Rev. xx. 11 sq. (Matt. xxv. 31 sqq.), according to Auberlen, p. 369, then Daniel's Apocalypse would say, that, with the judgment upon Antiochus, the one thousand years reign begins. But it is arbitrary to introduce into the prophecy of Daniel, from the Johannean Apocalypse, the ideas of the one thousand years reign, and of the two acts of the final judgment. The allusion to Antiochus is questioned by Auberlen and others, in ch. vii., but conceded by them in ch. viii.; the parallelism of the individual prophecies in the Book of Daniel decides, however, against Auberlen. The acknowledgment required by the text, that the apocalyptic expectation is greatly limited by the historical horizon, coheres with the conception likewise obtruded upon the book throughout its interpretation, that it is pseudepigraphic.

[2] Cf. also 2 Thess. ii. 3 sqq.; 1 John ii. 18 sqq.

[3] ii. 9, iii. 9.

[4] xi. 7 sqq.

deceived by the satanic false prophet, and worshipping the antichristic image of the beast, stands entirely in the service of Satan, and is the instrument for his rage against the congregation of saints.[1] Accordingly the final judgment proceeds, after Jerusalem has been trodden down,[2] in such a way that first the great harlot Babylon, i.e., heathen Rome,[3] is judged; after that, the demoniacal powers themselves, which were active in that human embodiment of antichrist, chiefly the beast worshipped by the heathen and the false prophet,[4] and then also Satan himself.[5] The judgment of all the dead forms the full completion of the entire eschatological catastrophe, at which death itself and hell are cast into the lake of fire.[6]

Two remarks are especially called for concerning this Apocalyptic contemplation of the antichristian powers, and the judgment upon them. 1. The judgment upon Jerusalem is presented, on the one hand, according to its inner connection with the proper final judgment. It belongs in the series of the three woes, of the second of which it forms the latter half.[7] But, on the other hand, this judgment upon Jerusalem is expressly distinguished from the final judgment itself which succeeds. In general, the entire prophecy referring to the future treading-down of the Holy City by the heathen not so much predicts the future fact of its overthrow as such, as it rather interweaves it, in a peculiarly ideal way, into the chain of its eschatological development.[8] 2. The concrete view of the heathen secular power under the form, present to the prophet, of the Roman secular power, which is expressed not only in the general description of ch. xiii. 17 sqq., but also in the most definite individual features,[9] appears limited by John's historical horizon to such an extent that he already mentions[10] the last of the Roman kings, who in the near impending advent of the Lord[11] is to be visited by the judgment. The sixth king is the present one; the seventh will remain only a short time; the eighth, the personification of the beast, will be the last.[12]

NOTE. — The proof for the above presentation can be given only by the exposition of the details from the text itself; yet so much should here be said concerning the nature of inspiration and prophecy, as is requisite, on the one hand, for the foregoing conclusion, and, on the other, for outlining the still deeper antitheses consequent upon methods and results of the criticism and exegesis of the Apoc. that are mutually contradictory.

[1] Ch. xii. sqq.
[2] xi. 1–14.
[3] xvii. 1 sqq.
[4] xix. 11 sqq.
[5] xx. 1 sqq., 7 sqq.
[6] xx. 11 sq.
[7] xi. 14.
[8] Cf. the *Exposition* from xi. 1–14.
[9] xiii. 18, xvii. 9 sqq.
[10] Just as in Dan. vii. 26.
[11] ἐν τάχει, ταχύ, "shortly," "quickly," i. 1, 3, xxii. 7, 12, 20.
[12] xvii. 10 sq.

Auberlen[1] distinguishes, according to exegetical results, "three main groups of expositions." 1. *The Ecclesiastical-Historical*, of which, in Germany, Bengel was the most prominent advocate, "considers the Revelation of John as a prophetic compendium of Church history." 2. *The Chronologico-Historical*, adopted by Herder, Ewald, De Wette, Lücke, Züllig, Baur, etc., "proceeds from a conception of prophecy which excludes an actual, divinely-wrought contemplation of the future," and refers the contents of the Apoc. to Jerusalem and Rome. 3. *The Governmental-Historical*,[2] adhered to by Hofmann, Hengstenb., Ebrard, and Aub. himself, "rests, as to its principle, upon the same basis as the *ecclesiastical-historical* over against the *chronologico-historical*. It believes in actual prophecy. It also does not deny the possibility of special prophecy, but only that the N. T. Apoc., so far as actually presented, is intended as a detailed history of the future." But against this classification, which unites, under No. 2, views the most divergent, and separates, under No. 1, those which are most closely allied, the most weighty objection may be urged. The chief defect is this: The exposition adopted by Bleek, De Wette, and Lücke is, on the one hand, directly contrary to the chronological-historical conception of the Apoc., as found in Grot., Eich., Heinrichs, etc.; and, on the other hand, has correctly grasped the idea, in conformity with the text, of the kingdom of Christ, and its fruition at his return, as the chief thought of the Johannean Apoc.: yet what really distinguishes the so-called *governmental-historical* interpreters[3] in respect to the Apocalyptic fundamental thought of the fruition of Christ's kingdom, from Lücke, etc., is nothing else than what belongs also to the *ecclesiastical-historical;* viz., the pretended historical detail, which both governmental-historical and ecclesiastical-historical expositors derive only by vying in arbitrariness of allegorizing with some of the chronologico-historical expositors,[4] against which Bleek, Lücke, and De Wette constantly contend. Naturally, the critical and exegetical conceptions of the Apoc. are distinguished according to the attitude which they take to the peculiar prophetic character which the book claims, and to the Apocalyptic fundamental thought which throughout pervades it. 1. By the *rationalistic* conception of inspiration and prophecy, the prophetical character which the Apoc. claims for itself is directly denied, and its fundamental thought entirely explained away. If John says that he was in the Spirit, this is *grata fraus*[5] (a pleasing delusion). All the pro-

[1] p. 411 sq.

[2] Cf., against this view, Baur, *Die reichsgeschichtl. Auffassung der Apok. Theol. Jahrbücher*, xiv., Tüb., 1855; 2, p. 283 sqq.

[3] Among whom it is difficult to reckon Hofmann, since he virtually refers the whole Apoc., not to the course of history unto the end, but only to the end itself; and also in one special point agrees with the *chronologico-historical* expositors. For in principle it is the same, whether the antichrist of the Apoc. be regarded as Nero returned, — which Aub. proposes as probably the *chronologico-historical* interpretation most properly so called, — or as Antiochus Epiphanes returned. (Hofm., ii. 345.)

[4] Grot., Eich., Herder, Heinrichs, etc.

[5] Eich. on iv. 1.

fessed visions are, in fact, nothing but fictions of a poetic genius; for by all those symbolical pictures the author represents "a future event, towards which all Christians looked forward with confidence; viz., the victory of Christianity over Judaism and heathenism." [1] When it is said in the Apoc., that *Christ* will be victorious, this is only a metonymy common "even in prosaic discourse," which is to be understood in the same way of "Christianity," as Jerusalem and Rome, by metonymy or symbolically, indicate Judaism and heathenism.[2] Upon this purely rationalistic standpoint, Grot. already stood, who, therefore, in the exposition of particulars, often agrees in a surprising way with Eich.[3] 2. It is according to a *magical* conception of inspiration and prophecy, that those whom Auberlen calls the ecclesiastical-historical and governmental-historical interpreters, give their exposition. There are found in the Apoc. the most special, and even chronological, predictions, which are fulfilled in the course of all time, from John's present even to the *parousia*. By allegorical interpretation, these predictions are derived from the text, as, conversely, the historical allusions of the Apoc. are accommodated by an allegorical interpretation to John's present. Upon this standpoint we find N. de Lyra, and after him chiefly the old Protestant expositors, with their applications to the Turks and the Pope;[4] then Bengel, with his Apocalyptic chronology; and in modern times, Hengstenb., Ebrard, Auberlen, and Hofmann: and if these, as a class, substitute general conceptions (powers, potencies, tendencies, etc.) for the definite forms invented by the older interpreters of the same class, yet recently H. J. Gräber[5] has again made the Turks and the Pope the chief subjects of the book. 3. It is from an *ethical*[6] conception of inspiration, that the present attempt at an exposition of the Apoc. will proceed, in connection with the labors of Bleek, De Wette, and especially of Lücke. In the most decided opposition to the above rationalistic denial of actual inspiration, the true prophetical character of the Apoc. will be here acknowledged, although understood otherwise than in the *magical* sense.

[1] Eich., Ein., p. 338. [2] a. a. O. S., 332.

[3] Cf., e. g., on i., 7.: *Aderit cum magna tempestate adversus incredulos Judaeos et Romanos*, "He will come with a great tempest against unbelieving Jews and Romans." On iii. 12: *Sensus est, eos qui in persecutione Neroniana constantes fuerint, visuros Spiritu prophetico, quomodo Deus secundum sua promissa triumphaturus sit de Judaeis et Romanis, quod praecipuum est Apocalypseos argumentum* ("The sense is, that they who in the Neronian persecution have been steadfast will see, by the prophetic Spirit, how God, according to his promises, will triumph over Jews and Romans, which is the chief argument of the Apocalypse").

[4] Cf., e. g., *Nic. Collado*, l. c., p. 32: *Totum hunc librum spectare praecipue ad describendam tyrannidem spiritualem Romani papatus et totius cleri ejus* ("That this entire book is directed chiefly to the description of the spiritual tyranny of the Pope of Rome and of all his clergy").

[5] *Vers. einer historischen Erkl. der Off. des Joh.*, Heidelb. 1857. Cf. also Ch. Paulus, *Blicke in die Weissagung der Off. des Joh.*, Stuttg. 1857. J. Ph. Sabel, *Die Offenb. Joh. aus dem Zusammenhange der messian-Reichsgeschichte*, Heidelb., 1861.

[6] Cf. my treatise: *De Rei prophetica in Vet. Test.—natura ethica, Apologet. Beiträge*, 1., Gött., 1865.

If Bengel[1] can decide that particular expressions of prophetic language, as angels, heaven, sun, etc., like "counters," mean sometimes one thing and again another,[2] this is here denied just as decidedly as, e. g., the possibility that John[3] could have written the name of the beast by the number 666, but could *not* himself have been acquainted with it.[4] These examples mark the distinction between a magical and an ethical conception of revelation. According to the former, what the prophet beholds is presented externally to him as a foreign object: he can behold every thing that the divine revelation will show him, and declare what he has beheld. According to the ethical view of the subject, the prophetic vision which appears by means of divine inspiration in the spirit of the prophet is conditioned by the entire subjectivity of the man; what the prophet writes is not a pure "copy" of a heavenly book,[5] but a divinely human product of his activity supported by the inspiring Spirit of God, in which the prophetic writer acts also in accordance with his human knowledge of art. According to a magical conception of revelation, the question why the little book eaten by John was in his mouth sweet, but in his belly became bitter,[6] may be answered,[7] "that the mouth of the seer was consecrated to his calling, but his belly belonged to the earthly world." On the other hand, in an ethical way, inspiration appears to be such as to sanctify and guide equally the entire indivisible personality of man in all his powers, the will as well as the intellect, the reason as well as the conscience and imagination, speech as well as writing and acting. Accordingly, the particular visions which John describes must be received for what he himself gives them; he has actually seen every thing, and the visions are not mere fabrications.[8] But the subjects contemplated have, as is usual, assumed a form according to the standard of the human subjectivity of the prophet. John, e. g., in ch. iv., beholds, and therefore describes, the cherubim in no other way than Ezekiel, but in their subjective truth; while but one of the two prophets could speak without error when the question was concerning objective reality. If, also, the visions in which John has beheld the individual plagues preceding the *parousia* of the Lord, have undoubtedly presented themselves, just as he testifies, to his spirit enlightened by God, it would only be a consequence therefrom, that every individual vision would contain a definite prophecy, to be actually fulfilled; unless the fantasy of a prophet be not touched by the inspiring Spirit of God, just as well as every other faculty of his inner man, and there would not therefore be a poesy produced and sancti-

[1] a. a. O. S., 89.

[2] The earth is made to signify "Asia" (Beng.), "the Jews" (Alcasar), "the godly" (Aretius), "the Christian part of the earth" (Vitr.), "Europe" (Launoi), the "godly world" (Stern), etc. The stars signify "the teachers of the church" (Aretius on vi. 12), "heretics" (Bede on viii. 2), "bishops" (Stern on viii. 10), "Jews" (Böhmer on vi. 12), "sovereigns" (Hengstb.), etc.

[3] Rev. xiii. 18.

[4] Hofm., a. a. O. II., p. 312. Likewise Kliefoth, *Theol. Zeitschr.*, 1862, p. 83. Christiani.

[5] Bengel, a. a. O. S., 319.

[6] x. 9 sq.

[7] Hofm., ii. p. 342. [8] Eich., Ewald, etc.

fied by the Spirit of God, which lends to the proclaimed truth the elevated beauty of a truly suitable form. The poesy of the writer of the Apocalypse stands in the same living relation to the subject of his prophecy as the rhetoric of a Paul or a John to the contents of their evangelical message and consoling discourse. Connected with this, also, is the fact that the writer of the Apocalypse, without injury to his actual character as prophet, is customarily limited by his historical horizon. A true prophet does not assume what the Sibyl boasts of herself:—

> Οἶδα ἐγὼ ψάμμων τ' ἀριθμοὺς καὶ μέτρα θαλάσσης,
> οἶδ' ἀριθμοὺς ἄστρων καὶ δένδρεα καὶ πόσα φύλλα, κ.τ.λ.[1]

Hence John does not prophesy what many expositors, in spite of the express warning of the Lord, have tried to decipher from the Apoc.; viz., the day and the hour of the establishment of his kingdom.[2] But he errs in regarding the form of the Roman Empire present to him as the last of its kind, because of the speedily approaching manifestation of the Lord himself to subdue all. Connected with this error is the truth of a morally understood inspiration, since this sunders man not from the natural fundamental condition of his individual personality; but what we dare not expect from a prophet is, e. g., the delusion ridiculed by cultivated heathen, that the deceased Emperor Nero,[3] or Antiochus Epiphanes,[4] shall return as antichrist.

The anti-Pauline Judaeo-Christian tendency of the Apocalypse, emphasized by the school of Baur for critical interests, is derived neither from the presupposed number of the twelve apostles (xxi. 14), nor from the polemical expressions of the epistles (ii. 2, 6, 14, etc.). The objectively firmly established number of the apostles is manifest even in Paul (1 Cor. xv. 5). The expressions against heretical manifestations, however we may decide concerning their controversial interpretation, are not, in any case, to be turned to account for the purpose of the school of Baur, because the free evangelical view of Paul concerning the *φαγεῖν εἰδωλόθ.* has ethical limitations, of which the heretical libertines of the Apocalypse wanted to know nothing, while in respect to the *πορνεῦσαι* the Apostle Paul speaks as decidedly as the author of the Apocalypse. In no respect did Paul declare *πορνεία* permissible (against Hilgenf.'s mutilated presentation, *Einl.*, p. 415). That the Judaic Christianity of the Apocalypse is not anti-Pauline and anti-evangelical, is manifest from the fact that the new Jeru-

[1] ("I know the numbers of the sands, and the measures of the sea,
I know the numbers of the stars, and how many trees and leaves.")
l. viii. p. 749. Sibylline Oracles, *Op. et Stud. Servatii Gallaei*, Amst. 1689.

[2] The artificialness with which an investigator of Scripture otherwise so excellent as Bengel (*Ordo temporum*, Stuttg., 1741, p. 303 sq.) seeks to weaken the clearest Scripture passages (Mark xiii. 32; Acts i. 7) is without a parallel.

[3] Ewald, Lücke, De Wette.

[4] Hofmann.

salem appears without a temple (xxi. 22). This is also contrary to E. Renan, *Der Antichrist*, Ger. ed., Leipzig and Paris, 1873 (p. xxvii, "The Apocalypse breathes dreadful hatred towards Paul," etc.).

SEC. III. — ORIGINAL INTENTION AND ORIGIN OF THE APOCALYPSE.

1. As to the *original destination of the Apocalypse*, — by which we understand not only the circle of readers according to its external local limitations, but also the purpose of the book, occasioned by these concrete circumstances and events, — we need especially speak only in a few words, since this original destination, which can be gathered with greater evidence from the context, is of importance in the examination of the difficult and controverted questions concerning its origin, and especially its author and the time of composition. The circle of readers in Asia Minor is expressly mentioned in the Apocalypse itself;[1] for even though the number *seven* of the congregations should have a definite typical significance, and correspond to the relation to the universal Church, peculiar to the Apocalypse by virtue of its fundamental thought, as well as asserted by itself,[2] yet the simple geographical destination in the text is the less to be explained away by any sort of allegorizing theory, as that typical reference to the universal Church is undoubtedly based[3] upon the firm foundation of fixed historical relations.[4]

The inner purpose of the Apoc. is also to be clearly recognized from the text itself. The paracletic elaboration of the fundamental thought concerning the impending return of the Lord, discussed in Sec. 2, 2, serves the purpose expressed already in the introduction and conclusion, and occasionally in other passages,[5] partly of encouraging and strengthening in fidelity, by the hope of the Lord's return, the seven churches, and still further the entire Church, in the distress already present and yet to be expected from the unchristian world (Jews and heathen), and partly, also,[6] to reprove and reform

[1] i. 4, 11; chs. ii. and iii.

[2] Cf. i. 3, xxii. 7, 16 sqq.

[3] See on i. 4, 11, 20.

[4] Hengstb. (i. 83), who also errs in stating that what is said in i. 4 sqq. refers not to the entire Apoc., but only to chs. ii. and iii., says, "When John wrote to the *seven* churches, he had already before his eyes the model of the seven catholic and the fourteen Pauline epistles, including the Epistle to the Hebrews, which, though even not altogether directly, yet proceeded from Paul as its source." The arbitrariness in this critical judgment (which not only presupposes that John had our canon of epistles, but also obtrudes upon the same an entirely senseless allusion to a simple and double enumeration of seven of those letters) is so great that Lücke (p. 421) not even once correctly understands Hengstb.'s real meaning. Cf., on the other hand, Bleek, *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1855, p. 168. The fragment of Muratori thinks that Paul followed John, as the former also wrote his letters to seven different churches.

[5] Cf. i. 3, 9, chs. ii. and iii, xvi. 15, xxii. 7, 10 sqq.

[6] Cf. the seven epistles.

the inner evils of the churches themselves, to guard and establish their good circumstances, and in general so to teach and guide those redeemed by Christ, that they may receive the blessed reward with which the Lord is to come.[1] The end of the Apoc. is therefore, even apart from the special inner relations of the seven churches, in so far a peculiar one, as the tribulation already suffered, and still impending, is the immediate occasion to which the rich fundamental thoughts concerning the personal advent of the Lord are so emphatically applied in consolatory hope and earnest warning, that the prophetic comfort contained in the entire book refers to that end;[2] but, on the other hand, no N. T. consolatory work is conceivable which does not serve, at least indirectly, to lead believers to the coming Lord, to whom they belong, and that, too, as must necessarily occur from the nature of the opposition between the kingdom of Christ and the world, through the very midst of unavoidable trouble. Thus the Apoc., in its end, has that exclusively and immediately which in all other N. T. literature appears as an indispensable, special (apocalyptic) item.[3]

2. The question concerning the original destination of the Apoc. leads back to the final critical question concerning the *origin* of the book, i.e., concerning its author, and the time and place of its composition. As the author of the Apoc.[4] belongs, as to his station in life, to the geographical circle in which are his first readers, and this circle belongs to a definite time, viz., the apostolic-Johannean, the question arises of itself, as to whether John, who announces himself as the author, is to be regarded as the apostle or not, — a question for whose answer it is highly important to determine, as far as possible, the time of the composition of the book, in its relation to the time[5] during which the Apostle John labored in Asia Minor.

Criticism is here occupied with the *testimony of the book concerning itself*, and the testimonies of ecclesiastical *tradition*. Every expression[6] of the book concerning itself appears doubtful, in the degree that the exposition, both as a whole and in particulars, is a matter of controversy, while the testimonies of tradition are in complete agreement neither with one another, nor with the statements of the book itself. If now, in the latter case, the book's own testimony is to be unconditionally preferred to that of tradition, the critical investigation will be the more difficult in proportion as the wit-

[1] xxii. 12.

[2] i.e., it is of an Apocalyptic nature.

[3] Cf. 1 Cor. i. 8; 2 Cor. iv. 14 sqq., v. 10, xi. 2; Phil. iii. 20 sq.; 2 Tim. ii. 9 sqq.; 1 Pet. i. 18 sqq., iv. 12 sqq.; Jas. v. 7 sqq.; 1 John ii. 28.

[4] Cf. i. 9.

[5] In itself, indeed, likewise uncertain.

[6] In their discussion we can and must distinguish what refers to the time and place of composition, from those referring to the person of the composer.

ness contradicting the book is, perhaps because of his age, the more important, and the origin of his error can be less readily traced. In addition to such exegetical and historical difficulties, is the consideration that the Apoc., by reason of its peculiar prophetical character, manifestly serves as a touchstone by which to test the entire theological culture of critics and exegetes, and, even apart from scientific elaboration, contains rich material as certainly for the pure hope of the Christian faith, as it does apparently for a curiosity that hankers after disclosures of the future. Thus is explained not only the fanatical abuse which is employed upon this book, but also the animosity by which the scientific investigation of this book is disturbed more than that of any other in the Bible, — the O. T. Apoc. perhaps excepted. The most candid and courageous judgment in regard to this has been excellently stated by Hengstenb.:[1] "The position which every one takes, with respect to the contents of the book, is decisive concerning his blessedness or condemnation."[2]

a. The book's *testimony concerning itself*, as to the place and time of composition, is (*a*) *direct;* i.e., there are in the Apoc. express declarations from which the time (and place) of composition can be learned, without requiring, as in the indirect testimonies, the interposition of a combination of relations occurring in other places.

As John's Apocalytic prophecy looks towards its proper goal, viz., the Lord's return, in such a way that there is presented within the historical horizon of the prophet, not only unbelieving Judaism, but also antichristian heathenism, and that, too, under the concrete form of Rome ruling the world;[3] so in these two respects the Apoc. contains direct chronological testimonies, viz., ch. xi. 1–14, and chs. xiii. and xvii. If the two testimonies harmonize chronologically, this is the more important as the contents of the former are in other respects dissimilar from those of the latter.

Whether xi. 1–14[4] be a prophecy concerning the impending destruction of Jerusalem as such, or not, may here be left entirely undecided. It is sufficient for chronological interest, that that prophecy depends upon the *presupposition that the destruction of the Holy City had not yet occurred.* This is derived with the greatest evidence from the text, since it is said, ver. 2, that the Holy City, i.e., Jerusalem,[5] is to be trodden down by the Gentiles.[6] This testimony of the Apoc., which is completely indubitable to an unprejudiced

[1] ii. 372.

[2] xxii. 18, 19.

[3] Cf. § 2, 3.

[4] Why E. Bohmer (*Ueber Verfasser und Abfassungszeit der johanneischen Apok.*, etc., Halle, 1855, p. 23) has not taken into consideration xi. 1 sqq., is inconceivable. Besides, he assigns the Apoc. to the time of the destruction of Jerusalem.

[5] Cf., besides, v. 8.

[6] . . . τ. ἔθνεσιν. καὶ τὴν πόλιν τὴν ἁγίαν πατήσουσι. Cf. Luke xxi. 23: καὶ Ἰερουσαλὴμ ἔσται πατουμένη ὑπὸ ἐθνῶν.

mind, can still be misunderstood only with great difficulty,[1] by accompanying its acceptance with the avowal that so eminent an interpreter as Irenaeus made an erroneous statement concerning the time of its composition.

The chronological results of xi. 1 sqq. are confirmed by what is said in chs. xiii. and xvii. Even here a completely certain explanation of all individual difficulties is not advanced, but only the recognition of certain fundamental lines of exposition: viz., that the beast rising from the sea with his ten horns, seven heads, and ten crowns (ch. xiii.), essentially signifies nothing else than the beast with seven heads and ten horns carrying the great harlot; in other words, that as certainly as the name of the beast (Λατεῖνος), indicated in xiii. 8, can apply only to the Roman secular empire, so also the mysterious name Babylon, xvii. 5, refers to Rome; and also that not only does xvii. 9 refer to the seven hills of the seven-hilled city, but also that the seven kings mentioned in xvii. 10, who are represented by the seven horns, are to be understood not of dynasties or governments, but of personal sovereigns, and therefore of the Roman emperors. If that be correct, then xvii. 18 contradicts the statement of Irenaeus, that the Apoc. was beheld under Domitian; for if five of the heads, i.e., emperors, have fallen, then the one at that time present, the sixth, can in no case be later than Vespasian. We reach him by beginning with Augustus, and passing over the three kings between Nero and Vespasian (Galba, Otho, Vitellius), regarding their short reign as an interregnum.[2] After this, the result of the combination of xvii. 10 with xi. 1-14 would be, that the Apoc. was written in that part of the reign of Vespasian which was prior to the destruction of Jerusalem, i.e., between the close of December, 69, and the spring of 70. And if the Lord's Day of i. 10 were to be regarded not as a Sunday, but as that particular day after which Sundays were designated as Lord's Days, then it would follow[3] that John beheld the revelation on Easter of the year 70.

Ewald and others regard the sixth emperor present to John, not as Vespasian, — since they do not reckon him as Nero's immediate successor, — but as Galba. In a chronological respect, the distinction is insignificant, as Galba reigned only from June, 68, to January, 69. More important is the diversity of exposition in chs. xiii. and xvii., upon which each of these chronological results respectively rests. According to our view, the account in

[1] Hofmann, a. a. O. II., p. 301. Hengstenb., etc.

[2] Cf. Suetonius, *Vespas.* 1: REBELLIONE *trium principum et caede* INCERTUM *diu et quasi* VAGUM IMPERIUM *suscepit firmavitque tandem gens Flavia.* "The Flavian *gens* at length received and established the *imperial power* which by the rebellion and slaughter of the three princes had been long *uncertain* and as it were *in transition.*"

[3] Böhmer, p. 29.

ch. xiii. presupposes that not only Galba, but also Otho and Vitellius, the latter of whom Ewald in no way considers, belong to the past; while the comparison with ch. xvii. yields the result that at that time Vespasian had the throne. For when John (xiii. 1 sqq.) ascribes to the beast *seven* heads, — of which one is wounded unto death, and yet healed, — but at the same time *ten* horns and *ten* crowns, he means on the one hand *ten* kings,[1] i e., *persons*, whose actual reign is symbolized by ten horns and crowns (viz., 1, Augustus; 2, Tiberius; 3, Caligula; 4, Claudius; 5, Nero; 6, Galba; 7, Otho; 8, Vitellius; 9, Vespasian; 10, Titus): but, on the other hand, the three usurpers between Nero and Vespasian could not have the same position with the other emperors as "*heads*" of the beast; on the other hand, "the rebellion of the three princes" which rendered "the imperial power uncertain and as though in transition," gave the mortal wound to the head of the beast, which was healed only when Vespasian seized the power. He, therefore, appears as the *sixth head* of the beast; he is the first of the Flavian family, which has again established the tottering government. But whether the sixth or the seventh head was then ruling, is learned not from ch. xiii., but from ch. xvii. Yet, notwithstanding the substantially identical significance in the whole, the presentation of details is not throughout the same. In ch. xiii., a beast appears as the symbol of the antichristian Roman Empire; while ch. xvii., under the figure of the harlot drunk with the blood of saints, sitting upon that beast, describes the world's metropolis, Rome, as the concrete embodiment of the Roman dominion over the world.[2] But even the beast itself is depicted and understood in a somewhat different way. The *seven heads*, i.e., emperors, are alike; but from the seven crowns there is no speech, but only from the ten horns, which, however, do not stand, as in ch. xiii., in a parallel with the seven heads, but describe[3] still future kings. *These* ten horns have therefore nothing whatever to do with the reckoning and interpretation of the seven heads, as is established from ch. xiii. and xvii. 10. The seven heads are, as in ch. xiii., the Emperors Augustus, Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, Nero — these five are fallen (xvii. 10); the sixth, which was then the present one; and Titus, the other which is still to come, and when come to remain only a short time. The *eighth*, symbolized by no special head on the beast, since he himself will be regarded the personification of the whole beast (xvii. 11), is, then, Domitian, the second son of Vespasian, the brother of Titus, of whom it is therefore said, ἐκ τῶν ἑπτά ἐστιν ("He is of the seven").[4] This eighth emperor John considers not only as the individual personification of the Roman

[1] Cf. xvii. 10.

[2] Cf. xvii. 18, ἡ πόλις; v. 9, ὄρη ἑπτά.

[3] xvii. 12.

[4] Cf. Exposition.

antichrist, but also as the last possessor of the Roman dominion over the world; as in his person this finds its complete fulfilment, with him it also perishes.[1]

In respect to the chronological interest, there is still only one point of the account in xvii. 8 sqq., to be kept in view, which serves to more accurately determine the declaration in xvii. 10. The beast, says John,[2] was, and is not, and shall ascend out of the abyss. Here not only the *μέλλει ἀναβαίνειν ἐκ τ. ἀβύσσου* (v. 8), but also the relation of the entire conception to that of the healed mortal wound,[3] can remain undiscussed. It results only in this: viz., the beast *is not*, and yet *is* the sixth of his heads. This can have the meaning only that the then present emperor (Vespasian), symbolized by the sixth head, has the dominion in such way that, while in one respect he must be regarded a real head of the beast, yet in another respect it may be said that the dominion over the world, signified by the beast, is not there. This prophetic enigma appears therefore to point to the time when Vespasian was proclaimed emperor by his Oriental legions, while Vitellius still stood at the head of his Germanic army. As Vespasian had, in fact, already won the empire, — for there was no doubt as to what would be the result of the war with Vitellius, — Vespasian was already the head of the beast; and yet his imperial power was not unquestioned and undivided, and the Roman dominion over the world lay neither in his hand nor in that of Vitellius. In so far, says John, the beast is not. This condition of things, which created violent commotion in Egypt, Syria (Palestine), and Asia,[4] where the legions swore allegiance to Vespasian, occurred in the beginning of the year 70. At this time, therefore, upon the basis of xvii. 8 sqq., we must put the composition of the Apoc.; and that, too, with the greater certainty, as we have already been taught from ch. xi. 1 sqq., that it at all events was completed before the destruction of Jerusalem.[5]

(*β*) The indirect self-witness of the Apoc. concerning the time of its origin, which is in its very nature more indefinite and doubtful,[6] lies in the relation of Christians to Jews and heathen, and in the intimations given of the inner circumstances of congregations. What appears in both respects, in the Apoc., appears on the one hand not so much in fixed historical form, as rather in the garb of a prophetic description; but, on the other hand, we are by no means so fully instructed concerning the historical relations mentioned

[1] xvii. 8, 11 sqq.

[2] xvii. 8, 11.

[3] xiii. 3, 4.

[4] Cf. Tacitus, *Histories*, ii. 78 sqq.; Suetonius, *Vespasian*, 5.

[5] It is improper, therefore, as, e.g., in Eichhorn, to fix the composition of the Apocalypse between the years 71 and 78. Cf., on the contrary, already Heinrichs.

[6] Cf. Lücke, p. 433 sqq., 820 sqq., with Hengstenb., i. p. 9 sqq.

in the Apoc., by accounts given elsewhere, as with confidence to recognize the temporal relations reflected in particular allusions of the book.

How great was the hostility of the Jews to the Christians, cannot be clearly learned from ii. 9 sq., iii. 9.[1] Defamations on their part occur during the entire apostolic and post-apostolic periods. We also know already, from the Book of Acts, that in the beginning the Jews instigated the civil authorities against the Christians. At the martyrdom of Polycarp, Jews and heathen made common cause.[2] Under the Roman government, the Jews did not dare with their own hands to do them violence. This was true in the time of Paul, as well as in that of Justin.[3] Yet it happened, especially at the time of the revolt against the Roman government, that the Jews also showed their hatred to the Christians by deeds of violence.[4] May it not, then, be supposed that the hostility of the Jews, indicated in the Apoc.,[5] was not content with mere "blaspheming," but brought upon Christians other sufferings also?[6] And is it not consistent with this, that by the war with the Romans the fanaticism of the Jews was stirred up? Perhaps in connection with what is said in xi. 3 sqq., the remembrance of what James the Lord's brother suffered at Jerusalem may be recalled.[7] The conjecture appears still nearer, that the promise to the church at Philadelphia[8] is not without reference to the impending destruction of Jerusalem. If, now, we put together the facts that it is *David's* key which the Lord has, and with which he has opened to the Church a door which no man can shut; that the Jews who hitherto have blasphemed are to acknowledge the Redeemer, and turn to the Church for aid; that the *speedy* return of the Lord[9] will bring the *new Jerusalem*, — all this is indicated, if we find herein traces in general of definite historical relations, not to the time of Domitian, whose heavy hand oppressed the Jews no less than the Christians, but to that of the destruction of Jerusalem. By that impending judgment, the Lord would

[1] Cf. also xi. 3 sqq.

[2] *Mart. Poly.*, c. 10 sqq.

[3] Cf. Justin, *Dial. c. Tryph.*, c. 16: καταρώμενοι ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς ὑμῶν τοὺς πιστεύοντας ἐπὶ τὸν Χριστόν. Οὐ γὰρ ἐξουσίαν ἔχετε αὐτόχειρες γενέσθαι ἡμῶν διὰ τοὺς νῦν ἐπικρατοῦντας· ὁσάκις δὲ ἂν ἐδυνήθητε, καὶ τοῦτο ἐπράξατε ("Cursing in your synagogues those who believed in Christ. For you do not have the power to lay hands upon us, on account of those who now have the mastery. But as often as you could, you did so").

[4] Justin, *Apol.*, i. 31: Ἀναιροῦντες καὶ κολάζοντες ἡμᾶς ὁπόταν δύνωνται — καὶ γὰρ ἐν τῷ νῦν γεγενημένῳ Ἰουδαϊκῷ πολέμῳ Βαρχωχέβας — Χριστιανοὺς μόνους εἰς τιμωρίας δεινάς, εἰ μὴ ἀρνοῖντο Ἰησοῦν τὸν Χριστὸν καὶ βλασφημοῖεν, ἐκέλευεν ἀπάγεσθαι ("They slay and punish us whenever they are able. For, in the Jewish war which lately raged, Barchochebas gave orders that Christians alone should be led to cruel punishments, unless they would deny Jesus Christ, and utter blasphemy").

[5] ii. 9 sq., iii. 9.

[6] θλῖψις, πάσχειν, ii. 9 sq.

[7] In the year 69. Cf. Gieseler, *Kirchengeschichte*, I. i. p. 125.

[8] iii. 9.

[9] iii. 11.

show the blaspheming Jews that in his death he had loved the Church,[1] but that upon that unbelieving people his blood would justly be avenged. It was just this judgment upon Jerusalem which would open their eyes; one indeed of fearful violence, but yet like a door opened by the key of David, whereby believers in Philadelphia could introduce those Jews who would hear and see, into fellowship with the eternal King upon the throne of David, and could establish them in the hope of the new Jerusalem.

More fruitful and definite are the allusions of the Apoc. to the Roman Empire in its relation to the Christians; but, even in this respect, the prophetic-poetical coloring, wherein necessarily the historical facts are presented, must be taken into consideration. It is by neglecting this, that Hengstenb., with seeming confidence, reaches the solution that the Apoc. could have been written at no other time than that of Domitian. This emperor was the first, he says, to have himself deified: only, therefore, to him is what is said in xiii. 4, 8, 12, and xviii. 18, applicable. But in ch. xiii., it is no particular sovereign (no particular head), but the entire beast, which, in its godless nature, is described. To the Roman imperial power, as such, is attributed the self-deifying pride, confiding in its own seemingly unlimited authority. If, in his prophetic description,[2] John had thought of special objects, they could be only such as, by recurring in a similar way in different possessors of the Roman power, characterize its entire antichristian nature. There belong the apotheosis conferred already upon Julius Cæsar;[3] the erection of altars which already pleased Augustus;[4] the madness of Caligula, who put the head of his own statue upon one of the Olympian Jupiter, and had himself saluted as Jupiter Latiaris, erecting a temple to himself, with special priests and sacrifices,[5] etc. But what is said in ch. xiii., concerning the Roman imperial power as such, is applied in xviii. 18 to the city as the concrete embodiment of the Roman dominion over the world.[6] "Every passage points to Domitian"[7] as little as to any other emperor; but John has in view the blasphemous pride, as, e.g., it displays itself in the altars consecrated in the city of Rome. Besides, what the

[1] iii. 9.

[2] Cf. Isa. xxxvi. 18 sqq.

[3] Suetonius, *Caes.*, 88. Cf. on Claudius Eutropius, *Hist.*, vii. 13.

[4] Suetonius, *Octav.*, 52: Templa in nulla tamen provincia nisi communi *suo Romaeque* nomine recepit. "He allowed temples, nevertheless, in no province unless in the common name of himself and Rome." Herod the Great already had erected, in a city so well known as Caesarea, a temple in honor of the Emperor Augustus, and in it his statue in the form of the Olympian Zeus, besides the image of Hera brought from Argos, representing Rome. Josephus, *B. Jud.*, i. 21, 7. Cf. Wieseler, *Beiträge*, Gotha, 1869. See especially the chapter *Kaisercultus* in L. Preller's *Romische Mythologie*.

[5] Suetonius, *Caligula*, 21

[6] Cf. ch. xvii.

[7] Hengstenb.

Apoc. says concerning the violence inflicted upon Christians on the part of the Roman world-power, John thinks also pertains only to the time of Domitian. That the book was written in the midst of the oppression of the Neronian persecution,[1] dare not be inferred, since that persecution was confined to the city of Rome, and to the infliction of capital punishment; while the Apoc. presupposes that the persecution was co-extensive with Christianity,[2] and was accompanied not only by executions, but by banishment to desert islands,[3] and imprisonment.[4] But since, where the antichristian world-power is beheld in the more definite form of the harlot who symbolizes the city,[5] it appears drunk with the blood of the martyrs; just in the degree in which the description of the world-power, ch. xvii. sqq., is more concrete than in ch. xiii., the leading feature in the picture of the hatred of antichrist has a coloring that is more historical, although the entire description always remains of so very a prophetical-poetic character, that the city, as the proper centre of the entire empire, appears stained with the blood of the martyrs shed not only in the empire, but in the whole world.[6] But that already, in the times before Domitian, Christians were cast into prison,[7] and had otherwise in their daily life to bear the scorn and hatred of the heathen,[8] is self-evident, especially after Nero himself in the capital had given the example by surrendering the Christians to the already long-existing hatred of the heathen. But, even without definite testimonies, it must be accepted, that, especially in the East, during the war against the rebellious Jews, the Christians, as the Romans took no pains to distinguish them from Jews, had to endure all kinds of oppression and persecution.

The allusions of the Apoc., therefore, refer no more to the times of Domitian than to those of Vespasian. But if we combine the passages already discussed, with the direct testimony derived from xvii. 10 sq., and with what is said in vi. 10 sq., there will be a new confirmation of the view that the Apoc. was written under Vespasian. The question of the souls of the martyrs, ἕως πότε, κ.τ.λ.,[9] presupposes that since their martyrdom some time already had transpired. Had the Apoc. been seen in the beginning of the year 70, this would have harmonized with its application to those martyrs: but the reference is especially to be ascribed to those executed by Nero at Rome; for, in July of the year 64, that persecution broke out in which Peter perished, after, as is highly probable, Paul had been slain

[1] De Wette, Lücke, Ewald, Bleek.

[2] Which Hengstenb. (i. p. 24) finds designated also in xiii. 7: πᾶσαν φυλήν — ἔθνος.

[3] i. 9.

[4] xiii. 10.

[5] Ch. xvii. sqq.

[6] xviii. 24.

[7] 2 Cor. x., xiii. 10.

[8] xiii. 16.

[9] vi. 10.

at Rome a few months previously.[1] Of course, in itself, the question ἕως πότε, κ.τ.λ., would be with complete propriety applicable to the times of Domitian; but this chronological reference is rendered impossible by the answer.[2] For, in a short time,[3] the longing of the martyrs for revenge will be satisfied; only a certain number of believers must first suffer the martyrdom appointed them also. Then the Lord comes, yea, he comes quickly,[4] to destroy drunken Rome. This is to be determined more accurately according to xvii. 10 sq. Domitian, the eighth, i.e., the last sovereign of the antichristian Roman Empire, is the one who, as the personification of the antichristian beast, will make the number of the martyrs complete, whereupon then the entire Roman sovereignty over the world will fall in ruins.

Finally, the inner circumstances of the Asiatic churches come into consideration, and especially the moral faults and false doctrines condemned in the seven epistles [5] If the Apocalyptic picture of any church be compared with such, e g., as is presented in the Pauline Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians, a contrast becomes manifest, which must then be chronologically estimated. Hengstenb. thinks that the space between the work of the Apostle Paul in the Asiatic churches, and the time of composition assigned by Lücke, to be too brief to account for such facts as that the first love should already have so greatly cooled, such peculiar errors have arisen, and, in general, the entire condition of the churches become so unsatisfactory as represented in the Apoc., and that the time of Domitian is the very earliest wherein this is conceivable. But, on the one hand, the departure of the Apostle Paul had withdrawn a firm support from the young congregations, — and even the Epistles to the Colossians and Galatians show how soon strong errors entered when the apostle's absence gave them room, — and, on the other hand, it is highly improbable that the condition of those seven churches would not have been better than the Apoc. indicates, if it had been actually written only towards the end of Domitian's reign, and therefore after the Apostle John had personally labored for almost a generation in those congregations as his own peculiar district.[6] But if we consider that between the close of Paul's activity in Asia,[7] and the beginning of the reign of Vespasian, — i. e., the time of the composition of the Apoc., — over twelve years intervene; and that since the composition of the Epistle

[1] Cf. Wieseler's *Chronologie des apost. Zeitalters*, Gött. 1848, p. 541 sqq.

[2] vi. 11.

[3] χρόνον μικρόν.

[4] ἐν τάχει, ταχύ, ὁ καιρὸς ἐγγύς.

[5] Chs. ii. and iii.

[6] Hengstenb. i. 54.

[7] He left Asia after a stay of almost three years, about Pentecost of the year 57. Wieseler, a. a. O. S., 118.

to the Ephesians,[1] perhaps eight years have passed; and, further, that the beginning of the more speculative and more practical errors which are reproved in the Apocalyptic epistles[2] had manifested themselves already in the times of Paul, — the condition of the Asiatic churches, presupposed by the Apoc., will not appear inconceivable at the time at which, for other reasons, we must fix the composition of the book.

Concerning the *place* where the Apoc. occurred, the author himself gives a definite testimony, inasmuch as he expressly states that on the Island of Patmos he received the divine revelation written in the book; for,[3] that the entire abode of the prophet on that island is only imaginary,[4] is an assertion without any foundation. But it is a further question, whether John also composed his book on that island. To Bengel, Hengstenb., etc., this is a matter of course, since they assume that the literary composition of the Apoc. was completed on the very same day on which the prophetic vision occurred. But[5] it is not only inconceivable, according to the nature of the case, that the ecstatic condition of the seer soon yields to the more tranquil self-consciousness required for literary composition, and then again soon recurs, and thus the vision interrupted by the act of writing every time returns to its original connection; but also the preterite ἐγενόμην[6] expressly contradicts the view that the Apoc. was committed to writing at Patmos. Besides, the book nowhere else contains any direct expression concerning the place of its composition. But if John[7] went to Patmos in order, in the quiet of that island, to receive the divine revelation to his spirit, and if, further, the Apocalyptic writing was intended for the seven churches of Asia Minor, the opinion is justified that John was at home among that circle of congregations, and that after his return from Patmos he wrote consecutively the revelation received for the seven churches. Perhaps Ephesus was the dwelling-place of John, and therefore the place of composition; for the conjecture readily arises, that the prophet passed over to Patmos from one of the cities[8] bordering closely upon the coast. But Ephesus is the nearest, and first mentioned.[9]

SEC. IV. — THE AUTHOR OF THE APOCALYPSE.

b. Concerning its author, also, the book itself gives testimony, both directly and indirectly. The former consists of such expressions as of

[1] In the year 61 or 62. Cf. Wetseler, p. 455.
[2] ii. 14, 20, 24.
[3] i. 9.
[4] Eich., *Einl.*, a. a. O. S., 366 sqq.; Volkmar, p. 63.
[5] Bleek, Lücke, etc.
[6] i. 9, 10.
[7] i. 9 sq.
[8] Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamos.
[9] i. 11, ii. 1.

themselves make known the author: the latter results from the comparison of the Apoc. with the Gospel and Epistles of the Apostle John.

(*a*) The direct *self-witness* of the Apoc. to its author.

As the author calls himself John,[1] first of all the question arises, whether or not he wished to be regarded as the apostle of that name. Even were this the case, criticism would have to ask further, whether the claim of the writer of the Apoc., to be regarded as the Apostle John, be actually justified or not. A result prejudicial to the canonical authority of the book would follow only in case criticism could with confidence decide that the author had falsely assumed the name of the Apostle John; for, while pseudonymity, in a purely literary work, may in a moral respect be a matter of indifference, yet where not only the treatment is directed to the edification of Christian churches, but also where the attaching of a name thereto must serve to guarantee the truly prophetic authority of a writer, such absence of a delicate sense of regard for truth would be presupposed as would disqualify a Christian writer for full canonical credit. For, to a writer of such kind, the possible literary custom of the time, according to which pseudonymity is not regarded as properly false, would afford no adequate excuse; since in his moral character he must stand far above his times, if to these times, and those which are to follow, he is to give an actual norm, dependent upon divine inspiration. But, without any difficulty with respect to the canonical authority of the Apoc., it is the decision of criticism that the author is to be regarded not the Apostle John, for the very reason that he does not claim to be such.

The mere mention of his own name, on the part of the author, does not serve so much to make us acquainted with the person as, rather, to present the critical question, according to whose different answers the critics fall into two chief classes, as the author of the Apoc. is or is not regarded the Apostle John. The former class falls, again, into two very dissimilar groups. The one group consists of critics who ascribe to the Apostle John not only the Apoc., but also the Gospel and the three Epistles. To this first group belong all the Catholic expositors and critics;[2] the old Protestants; and — after the Apostolic-Johannean authenticity of the Apoc. was attacked in England by an anonymous edition of the N. T.,[3] and by a likewise anonymously published "Discourse, Historical and Critical, on the Revelation

[1] i. 1, 4, 9, xxii. 8.

[2] Cf. Hug, *Einl.*, ii. § 176. C. Stern, *Kommentar über die Offenbar. des Apostels Joh.*, Schaffh. 1854. G. K. Mayer, *Die Aechtheit des Evangeliums nach Joh.*, Schaffh. 1854, p. 139 sqq., 222 sqq.

[3] The New Testament in Greek and English, etc., London, 1729.

ascribed to St. John" (Lond., 1730), by F. Abauzit,[1] and in Germany by the school of Semler[2] — men like Leonh. Twells,[3] J. F. Reuss,[4] F. A. Knittel,[5] Bengel, J. B. Lüderwald,[6] G. C. Storr,[7] Hartwig, Herder, Eichhorn, J. F. Kleuker,[8] Haenlein,[9] E. W. Kolthoff,[10] E. Dannemann;[11] and recently Hengstenberg, Ebrard, A. Niermeyer,[12] Elliot,[13] Auberlen, E. Böhmer, Gebhardt, Kliefoth, etc. On the other hand, the second group is composed of the school of Baur,[14] which ascribes the composition of the Apocalypse to the Apostle John, while it denies his authorship of the Gospel and the three Epistles.[15]

The critics of the second class, also, who deny the composition of the Apoc. by the Apostle John, fall into different groups, as some who occupy the older rationalistic standpoint regard[16] the Apoc. as a supposititious writing;[17] while the later, more scientific criticism, which controverts the compo-

[1] Concerning the remarkable history of this work written originally in French (Abauzit, *Œuvres diverses*, t. i., London, 1770), cf. Lücke, p. 496 sq.

[2] Oeder, *Freie Unters. über die sogennante Off. Joh. mit Anmerk. von Semler*, Halle, 1769. Semler, *Abhandl. von freier Unters. des Kanon, nebst Antwort auf die Tübing. Vertheidigung der Apok.*, Halle, 1771. Semler, *Neue Unters. über Apok.*, Halle, 1776.

[3] A critical examination of the late New Text and Version of the N. T. in Greek and English, London, 1732. Cf. Wolf, *Curae Philolog. et Crit. . . . in Apoc.*, Hamb. 1735, p. 387 sqq.

[4] *Dissert. theol. de auctore Apocal.*, Tüb. 1767. Cf. his *Vertheidigung der Off. Joh. gegen — Semler*, Frankf. 1772.

[5] *Beiträge zur Kritik über Joh. Offenbarung.*, Braunschweig and Hildesh. 1773.

[6] *Bemühungen zur gründlichen Beurtheilung und Erkenntniss der Offenb. Joh.*, Helmst. 1777-78.

[7] *Neue Apologie der Offenb. Joh.*, Tüb. 1783. *Zweck der evangel. Gesch. u. der Briefe Joh.*, Tüb. 1786, p. 70 sq.

[8] *Über den Ursprung und Zweck der Off. Joh.*, Hamburg, 1800.

[9] *Handbuch der Einleit. in die Schriften des N. T.*, vol. i., Erl. 1801, p. 220 sqq.

[10] *Apocalypsis Joanni Ap. vindicata*, Hafn. 1834.

[11] *Wer ist der Verf. der Off. Joh.*, Hannov. 1841.

[12] *Verhandeling over de Echtheid der johanneischen Schriften*, Gravenhage, 1852. Cf. Lechler, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1856, p. 867 sqq.

[13] *Horae Apocalypticae, or a Commentary on the Apocal., critical and historical*, iv. ed., London, 1851.

[14] Cf. Baur, *Krit. Untersuchungen über die kanonischen Evangelien*, Tüb. 1847. *Das Christenthum und die christl. Kirche der drei ersten Jahrhunderte*, Tüb. 1853.

[15] Volkmar deviates so far from these as to assert that the Apoc. was composed not by the Apostle John himself, but only in his spirit by an anti-Paulist. Cf., on the other hand, Hilgenf., *Der Kanon und der Kritik des N. T.*, Halle, 1863, p. 236. *Einl.*, p. 681.

[16] Abauzit, Oeder, Semler, etc, M. Merkel, *Historisch-krit. Aufklärung über die Streitigkeiten der Aloger — als Beitrag zum zuerlässigen Beweise, dass die Apok. ein unächt Buch sei*, Frank. and Leipz. 1782. *Umständlicher Beweis, dass die Apok. ein untergeschobenes Buch sei*, Frank. and Leipz. 1785. H. Corrodi, *Krit. Gesch. des Chiliasmus*, Zür. 1781 sqq., vol. ii. sec. 12 sqq. *Versuch einer Beleuchtung der Gesch. des jüd. u. christl. Bibelkanons*, Halle, 1792, vol. ii. p. 301 sqq., etc.

[17] Oeder (cf. also Corrodi, ii. 332) again advanced the idea already expressed in ancient

sition of the Apoc. by the Apostle John (i.e., by the author of the Gospel and Epistles), more or less definitely asserts that the writer of the Apoc. did not wish to be regarded the Apostle John, and, therefore, that the book is not supposititious, although it cannot be ascertained with certainty whether the writer be possibly the presbyter John,[1] or another of the same name,[2] — perhaps the evangelist John Mark.[3]

From the fact that the writer of the Apoc. calls himself John, it does not immediately follow that he must be regarded the apostle of that name, but only that to the first circle of readers of the book that self-designation of the prophet must have been sufficient. Quite a different representation has been made, not only to us, but already in ancient times, by the tradition that the Apostle John composed the revelation to which that name is attached.[4] But the question is, whether the book itself contains any further intimations concerning the composer. There are none such in the expression, τῷ δούλῳ αὐτ., i. 1, ascribed improperly to John's apostolic office; nor in the ἐμαρτύρησεν, i. 2, which no more contains any allusion to a former written declaration of John, i.e., to his Gospel, than in the ὅσα εἶδεν there is to be found any to the fact[5] that John was an eye and ear witness;[6] nor also from i. 9 sqq., for the ancient tradition of the banishment of the apostle to the Island of Patmos arises from a misunderstanding of this passage, which does not speak in any way concerning a banishment.[7] The immediate self-witness of the Apoc. concerning the John whom it mentions as its author is of *negative* character, as it only makes known that the writer of the Apoc. is *not* the Apostle John. [See Note I., p 87.] No trace of apostolic authority shows itself in the relation of the writer of the Apoc. to the churches to and for whom he writes. John writes only as a brother and companion,[8] without asserting that paternal attitude to his little children which the Apostle John takes in his first Epistle, without detracting from his fraternal fellowship, and of which some indications or other must have been found in the Apoc. if this had actually been written by the Apostle John, and at the end of his life, after many years' service in those churches. The author of the Apoc. writes not from apostolic sovereignty, but from an especial revelation; even the seven epistles were expressly dictated to him by the Lord. The apostle

times (cf. § 5), that the Apoc. derived its origin from Cerinthus.

[1] Bleek, Ewald, ii. 66.

[2] Heinrichs, Ewald, De Wette, Lücke; Neander, "History of the Planting and Training," etc., Hamburg, 1841, vol. ii. p. 540 sq.

[3] Hitzig, *Über Johannes Markus u. s. Schriften*, Zür. 1843. Cf., on the other side, Lücke, p. 778 sqq.

[4] See above, sec. 5.

[5] Kliefoth.

[6] Acts xxi. sqq.

[7] See Exposition, and cf. sec. 5.

[8] Rev. i. 9.

hardly needed the complete and emphatic attestation to which the prophet refers in his special appeal.[1] Possibly it is still more important that[2] nowhere, neither in the introduction[3] nor at the close, is there the least trace of the confidential relation between the Lord and the Apostle John.

A peculiar testimony to the fact that the author is not one of the apostles, he himself gives in the way in which he portrays their prominent position in the Church. In the twelve foundations which support the walls of the New Jerusalem, are the names of the twelve apostles;[4] in the second half of the twenty-four elders who stand before the throne of God, are probably to be reckoned the twelve apostles, regarded as the patriarchs of the N.T.[5] The point here[6] is not so much that such a representation would be a violation of modesty if the author of the Apoc. were himself one of the twelve apostles,[7] as, on the other hand, it has to do with the complete objectivity with which the twelve apostles are presented to the author of the Apoc. This has been felt even by Hengstenb., only with the result that he has not inferred that the author of the Apoc. must stand outside of that apostolic twelve, but simply that the Apoc. could have been composed "only at the end of the apostolic period." Yet this does not remove the difficulty of the writer of the Apoc. seeing *himself* among the elders in heaven, and his own name in the twelve foundations of the New Jerusalem. Even the appeal to Eph. ii. 20 does not serve to render what is said in Rev. xxi. 14 inconceivable in the mouth of an apostle. While we concede that in the former passage the gen. τῶν ἀποστόλων is an appositive gen. to the τῷ θεμελίῳ, and therefore, that, according to a different mode of conception from 1 Cor. iii. 11, the apostles and prophets are themselves considered the foundation of which Christ is the corner-stone;[8] yet we do not conclude[9] that only a *pupil* of the apostles could have written thus concerning the apostles, as it is written in Eph. ii. 20, but we believe that only Paul, not one of the twelve, could have thus written. Just, therefore, as Paul (Eph. ii. 20) distinguishes himself from the apostles,[10] John[11] evidently presupposes that he himself does *not* belong to the twelve. [See Note II., p. 87.]

(β) The *indirect self-witness* of the Apoc. to its author lies in the relation occupied by the Apoc. to the writings of the Apostle John. In the entire mode of conception and statement, in type of doctrine, and in many linguis-

[1] i. 9 sq.

[2] Cf. Ewald, *Jahrbücher der bibl. Wissensch.* v. 1853, p. 179 sqq.

[3] Cf. especially i. 9–20.

[4] xxi. 14.

[5] iv. 4, 10.

[6] Cf. also xviii. 20.

[7] Ewald. Cf., on the contrary, Hengstenb.

[8] Cf., on the contrary, Meyer.

[9] De Wette.

[10] Cf., especially, also 1 Cor. xv. 5, 7, 11.

[11] Rev. iv. 4, xxi. 14.

tic peculiarities, the author of the Apoc. is clearly to be distinguished from the author of the Gospel and the Epistles of John; i.e., from the apostle.

It must be acknowledged at the very beginning, that, from the indirect self-witness of the Apoc. on all the sides above mentioned, a completely rigid proof cannot be deduced. For as the Apoc. belongs to an entirely different class of writings from the Gospel and the Epistles of John, as even the Apoc. epistles could not have the same literary character as the three epistles of the apostle, it depends ultimately upon the tact of the critic cultivated in the Holy Scriptures, as to whether he will decide that the differences between the Apoc. and the writings of the Apostle John, denied by no thoughtful person, have their ultimate foundation in the difference of subjects, or the personal diversity of authors. And this decision is in no way conditioned alone by critical observations as such, but rests fundamentally upon certain theological principles, which in the critical function may be said to be transparent. For, just to the degree in which the visions described in the Revelation are in their genesis to be regarded independent of the individuality of the prophet, and the composition of the book to be only a relation of images previously objectively formed, and not as a conception and composition conditioned by the subjectivity of the prophet,[1] must the critical significance of the differences indicated vanish. From this standpoint, therefore, it may be asserted that it is inconceivable that the composition of the Apoc. and the other Johannean writings should have been contemporaneous;[2] yea, the substantial ignoring of the difference between the Apoc. and the Gospel with the Epistles, in connection with which there is perhaps an allusion still made to the difference in the character of the subjects, is from that standpoint much more correct than when it is accounted for by the statement, that, between the composition of the Gospel and the Apoc., there lies almost the life of a generation, in which time the apostle could have developed from the author of the Apoc. to that of the Gospel. Even though this development be not regarded a retrogression, as by Eichhorn and other rationalists, who find in the Gospel and the Epistles traces of old age, an unfitness of John to be the author of the Apoc. is thus assumed which agrees ill with the idea of his apostolic office, and that, too, apart from the fact that then the testimony of Irenaeus, according to which the Apoc. originates with the Apostle John and towards the end of Domitian's reign, must be abandoned at least as to its latter half. Hengstenb. is therefore, from his standpoint, correct throughout, when, holding fast to the testimony of Irenaeus even in a chronological respect, he denies that the differences

[1] Cf. sec. 2.

[2] As, e.g., the Catholic Mayer.

between the Apoc. and the other Johannean writings are such as to justify the inference of different authors, and proceeds, on the other hand, to trace the peculiarities of the Evangelist also in the writer of the Apocalypse. For then the defence rests with all emphasis upon the assumption that John, as writer of the Apoc., was "in the Spirit," which as Evangelist he was not.[1] Besides, not only does Hengstenb. see in the declaration, *ἐγενόμην ἐν πνεύματι*[2] that which "convicts of falsehood"[3] the critics who wish the human genius of the writer of the Apoc. to be recognized, in distinction from that of the Evangelist; but he regards it *a priori* self-evident that so great a prophecy as that of the Apoc. "could proceed" only from the circle of the apostles, yea, only from one who among the apostles himself had one of the first places."[4] This Apocalyptic prophecy, he says, "is the N. T. prophecy absolutely," the "highest apostolic gift;" and who "has this in the highest degree need not first assert that he is an apostle."[5] This is not meant as though the Apoc. element belonged only to N. T. prophecy;[6] but in the sense in which Auberlen also asserts that the summit of all biblical prophecy is the apocalyptic, which is presented in the Book of Daniel and the Revelation of John.[7] But just as certainly as the allegorical mode of exposition, by which Hengstenb., Auberlen, etc., find in the Apoc. the most special and comprehensive circumstances, is incorrect, is it without proper foundation to accord to the writer of the Apoc. the highest honor of prophetic character. It is a kind of exegetical superstition, which prevents the recognition, by means of an impartial comparison, of the difference between the Apoc. and the apostolic and especially the Johannean writings. The essential distinction between the entire mode of contemplation, and accordingly of statement also, of the writer of the Apoc. and the Apostle John, lies — to speak briefly and directly — in this: that in the former a mode of contemplation appealing to the

[1] a. a. O. II., pp. 425, 431.

[2] i. 10.

[3] a. a. O., 1st ed. p. 170.

[4] i. p. 39.

[5] a. a. O.

[6] s. o. sec. 2.

[7] It is characteristic of the three different theological fundamental views which obtain among the critics and exegetes of the Apoc. (s. o. sec. 2), how the estimation of the book goes hand in hand with the critical judgment concerning its apostolic or non-apostolic origin. Hengstenb., Auberlen, etc., regard the book as written by the Apostle John, because it presupposes the greatest fulness of apostolic inspiration. Baur and his school regard the book as written by the Apostle John, because standing on so low a stage of Christian, viz., Jewish-Christian, culture, that its production in the apostolic times, whither the strongest tradition points, is conceivable. Lücke, De Wette, etc., regard the book as not written by the Apostle John, because to them it stands beneath the line of full apostolic dignity, especially as it appears far inferior to the intellectual elevation of the Johannean writings. Cf. De Wette, p. 6: "A book, of which we must lay aside an entire chapter as an empty shell after having pressed out a few drops of juice." Cf. also Luther in his *Preface* of 1523.

senses, and in the latter one to the spirit, is expressed. In the writer of the Apoc., the fancy prevails; while in the apostle there is pure thought, in its free truth, speculative depth, and gracious life-power. When the writer of the Apoc. introduces, prior to the actual advent of the Lord, long series of purely earthly and cosmic plagues, or of such as are produced by infernal creatures, e.g., scorpion-like grasshoppers and ignivomous horses, such fanciful mode of contemplation is as foreign to the Evangelist as is the statement of the writer of the Apoc. concerning the nearness of the advent, since the latter not only regards the then existing Roman Empire as the last form of antichristian heathenism, but designates a definite emperor, who by the coming of the Lord is to be overthrown and perish. Besides, if such expositors are to be justified, who [1] hold, concerning this, that the writer of the Apoc. considers Nero returned from the dead as the eighth and last emperor, it is of course comprehensible if the incorrectness of such an exposition becomes, to the criticism of the school of Baur, a proof against the origin of the Apoc. from the Apostle John; but one who acknowledges the N. T. conception of apostolic endowments and authority,[2] and finds the Gospel with the Epistles of John corresponding thereto, should need no proof that the apostle could not have written such a fable of a Nero *redivivus*.

If particular examples be required, in order — in contrast with the pneumatical character of the apostle — to estimate what is peculiar to the writer of the Apoc., who loves to display every thing in concrete, plastic forms, in fixed and defined mass and numbers, we need only recall the seven Spirits of God,[3] the description of the throne of God and the new Jerusalem, the seven angels,[4] the angel of the waters,[5] etc.; even general tabular statements of numbers and places [6] belong here. If the Apoc. be received according to its own presentation, it is easily understood how through this peculiar character of concrete, external visibility, the poetic beauty of the book is essentially conditioned; [7] but at the same time such a species of poetic genius makes itself perceptible as is entirely different from the personality of the Apostle John, devoted entirely to introspection, and most delicately organized for purely spiritual objects and relations.

The characteristic distinction of the mode of presentation (style) is, as a whole, chiefly only the necessary reflection of the underlying mode of contemplation; yet certain elements and means of presentation also come into

[1] As even Niermeyer, who yet wishes to assert the composition of the Apoc. by the Apostle John.

[2] Cf. my treatise on the Apostle Peter, Hann. 1876.

[3] i. 4, v. 6.

[4] viii. 2.

[5] xvi. 5.

[6] Cf. on ix. 14.

[7] In connection with which, there is also the artistic blunder of viii. 12.

consideration, which have their natural source outside of the personality of the author, but just on this account afford a fulcrum for the science of criticism, by giving the means for judging as to whether the Evangelist John has appropriated the items conditioning the mode of presentation in the same way as has the writer of the Apocalypse. It is, in general, a characteristic of the deliberation manifest in the mode of thought of the Apostle John, that the statement has something on which it lingers, giving opportunity for calm contemplation, and presenting it on its various sides in what might be called a circular movement about a subject which is still kept close at hand.[1] United with this is that gracious and gentle love which understands, also, how to use mild speech as a means to reach the heart. But, with this keynote of the Apostle John's discourse, the manner of the Apocalypse throughout does not harmonize. It is self-evident that the writer of the Apocalypse cannot speak in the key of the First Epistle of John; but if these two works came from the same composer, it would nevertheless result, that just as the distinction in mode of statement in the Epistles, and the historical writing of the apostle, in no way conceals the essential similarity, so, also, the distinction based upon the subject-matter between an apocalyptic and an epistolary or historical style, must still manifest a deeply underlying identity of authorship. But that is not the case. In the Apocalypse, another mind thinks, another heart beats, and another mouth speaks. This is not said in the least to the discredit of the writer of the Apocalypse; for there must be in the kingdom of God many men, even many teachers, and yet not every one is to speak like the one who leaned on the Lord's breast. But this voice of the disciple we cannot recognize again in the language of the writer of the Apocalypse. Even the Apocalyptic epistles, that to Ephesus not excepted, are written in the lapidary style of brief sentences of the sharpest precision. The introductions *τάδε λέγει*, *κ.τ.λ.*, the incontrovertible *οἶδα*, the incisive reproofs, peremptory demands of repentance, and direct threats, even the accredited sentences and rich promises, possess, in the most pregnant way, the majestic sublimity which is peculiar to the entire book; but throughout, there is so little of the subtile magic of the apostle's mildness, which expresses itself in the gentle harmony of a flexible style, that on the other hand, even in the minutest details, the structure of words and sentences of the writer of the Apocalypse is such as to render rough and stiff his language, which by its disdain of all polish, yea almost of all signs of inner consecutiveness of thought,[2] is just as truly the mode of expression

[1] Cf. my Comm. on 1 John i., p. xxix. sqq.

[2] It has been observed, e.g., that, from ch. iv. on, almost all the sentences begin with *καί*, while chs. i.–iii. are mostly without any express connective; and that the Apocalyptic style is remote from that circumstantiality

corresponding to his peculiar mode of contemplation, as it appears foreign to the Evangelist and epistolary writer John. [See Note III., p. 87.]

The mode of contemplation and expression of the Apocalypse has been called Old-Testamental and Judaeo-Christian; yea, there has been found in it even a strong leaning towards rabbinical and cabalistic representations: while the Apostle John stands at the summit of the New-Testament standpoint, and his entire mode of contemplation and speech is Gentile-heathen, Hellenistic. In this point, also, the criticism of the Apocalypse displays the most remarkable irregularities. Herder, e.g., holds to the origin of the book from the Apostle John, and his judgment is: "The whole — the design, from which I can explain, in its place, every thing, to every manifestation, every angel, every sign, almost, I might say, every word — is the vision of Christ in the beginning of the book, *clothed in the brilliancy of the Sephiroth.*"[1] To Baur[2] the Judaic narrowness of the book (as he regards, e.g., Rev. xxi. 14, as excluding Paul from the number of the apostles, and ii. 2, vi. 9, 14 sq., to be an attack upon Paul and Pauline Christianity[3]) is an historical trace of its origin from the Apostle John. Ewald, who finds in the Apocalypse far more that is rabbinical than do Lücke, Bleek, and De Wette,[4] for this reason denies that it is the apostle's; while Hengstenb., etc.,[5] deny every thing rabbinical and cabalistic, explaining what is seemingly so immediately from the Old Testament, and trying to trace the same in the Evangelist, in order to ascribe the Apocalypse to the Apostle John.

In order, therefore, to establish that the distinction between the Apocalypse and the other Johannean writings is accountable by the diversity of authors, there is no need of proof that the Apocalyptic modes of conception and expression are so greatly interpenetrated by rabbinical-cabalistic elements, as Herder even expressly asserts, or that they stand upon so low a standpoint of Judaic bias as the school of Baur believes that it discerns, — for the one is as incorrect as the other, — but it results from two sources that are at hand, and scarcely need citation; viz., the relation of the Apocalypse to the Old Testament, and, even if all other numerical statements be omitted, the application, according to no Old-Testament type, of the art of *gematria*[6]

which the apostle delights to present in the parallelism of positive and negative sentences. An appeal to disprove this is improperly made to Rev. ii. 9, xx. 6 (Nierm.). Besides, two individual examples would not prove linguistic character; but compare these sentences with the apostle's mode of expression, e.g., in 1 John ii. 4 sq., v. 10.

[1] a. a. O., p. 334.

[2] *Unters. über die kanon. Evang.*, pp. 345 sq., 368.

[3] *Id.*, § 2, *Anmerk.*

[4] Cf. especially Lücke, p. 688 sqq.

[5] Cf. Hävernick, *De Kabbalistica, quae Apocalypsi inesse dicitur, forma et indole*, Rost. 1834.

[6] [i. e., the numerical indication of names. See Farrar's *Early Days of Christianity*, p.

for the purpose of concealing (xiii. 18). In both respects, the Apocalypse stands as far from the Apostle John as possible. Long ago it was noted,[1] that the Apocalypse does not contain a single express citation,[2] but also that it is filled through and through with allusions to, and reminiscences of, the Old Testament. No book of the New Testament is, in tone, so completely Old-Testamental as is the Apocalypse; but, on the other hand, the Old-Testamental tone is heard nowhere less than in the Gospel and Epistles of John. But the resort to an enigma whereby the writer of the Apocalypse[3] describes in numbers a name whose letters, in their numerical valuation, yield that sum, is of such nature, that the writings of the Apostle John do not offer even the most remote similarity; but what is similar occurs in the Epistle of Barnabas, where the number 318 is applied so that 18 designates the letters I H, the initial letters of the name of Jesus, while the 300, which is written with the cruciform T, is made to point to redemption. Similar is the designation of the name of Jesus, in the sibylline books, by the number 888;[4] and the prophecy that Rome will stand as many years as the numerical value of the letters declares, viz., 948.[5] [See Note IV., p. 88.]

The differences occurring in *type of doctrine* between the writer of the Apoc. and the Apostle John are, in general, to such an extent conditioned by diversity in their mode of conception, that the particular examples pertaining thereto, concur partly with those above cited. We confine ourselves to the presentation of only a few that are especially clear; more especially, as even among critics who, because of the diversity in doctrinal views, distinguish the writer of the Apoc. from the Apostle John, it is not firmly established — and, from the nature of the case, it cannot in many cases be firmly established to all — wherein and how far a diversity of individuality in the composer is proved, and how much perhaps must be ascribed to diversity in the literary class of composition to which the books belong.[6] Of most decided significance is the one, that the Apoc. teaches a first and a second resurrection, of which the writings of the Apostle John know as little as they do of the one thousand years reign, which the Apoc. places

468 sqq.; and article by same author, on Rabbinical Exegesis, in *The Expositor* for 1877, 1st series, vol. v. 7.]

[1] Cf. Bengel's *Gnomon* on i. 3.

[2] Even not i. 7, with which John xix. 37 is apt to be compared. But the evangelist quotes; the writer of the Apoc. does not; and not only the wording, but also the relation of the two passages, is essentially different.

[3] xiii. 18.

[4] Sibyll. Or., ed. Gall., i. p. 176.

[5] *Id.*, viii. p. 715 sqq.

[6] Cf. Ewald, *Comment.*, p. 74; Lücke, p. 707 sqq.; Bleek, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1855, p. 500 sqq. On the other side, Hengstenb., ii. p. 444 sqq.; cf. also H. Gebhardt, *Der Lehrbegriff der Apok.*, Gotha, 1873. [English, Edinburgh, 1878.]

between the first and the second resurrection.[1] But this distinction in the type of doctrine appears especially conspicuous in that the Evangelist also[2] speaks in his way of a twofold resurrection, but properly understands only the second to be expected at the Lord's advent; while he places the spiritual quickening in faith, the passing from death to life,[3] as a spiritual resurrection, parallel with the bodily resurrection at the last day.[4] [See Note V., p. 88.]

No less important is the dissimilarity in the representation of antichrist, and his hostility to Christ and his kingdom. The apostle knows of one antichrist; i. e., a human personality who will appear in a notable way as an instrument of Satan.[5] We do not believe, as does Bleek,[6] that John, in his first Epistle, mentions antichrist as an individual personality, in order to correct this idea, and to change it into that of the many antichrists: but, on the one hand, the apostle gives no complete and precise description of antichrist; and on the other, because of the inner connection between the one antichrist and the already present many antichrists, who have proceeded from the Christian Church, and now disturb it by the false doctrine denying that the Son of God has come in the flesh, he appears to the apostle to be not one who attacks Christianity externally through the hatred of Jews and heathen, but who internally agitates it with diabolical deceit by undermining the foundation of faith. All this is different in the Apoc.; and just where an apparent similarity occurs,[7] there is in fact the greatest difference. What is the antichrist, the beast from the sea,[8] or the two-horned beast, the false prophet?[9] Each, of course, in its manifestation, appears once in a definite human personality;[10] but in the person of the Roman emperor, in whom the Roman dominion over the world, displayed under the image of a beast, is concentrated and expressed. Even the false prophet has immediate reference, not with respect to an opposition to divine fundamental truth, but only as regards the first beast, whose blasphemous worship he requires. Such an idea of antichrist as the Apostle John indicates in his Epistles[11] is foreign to the Apoc. It not only presents other forms in which antichrist exists, but has an entirely different tendency and meaning. With this concurs the circumstance that the Apoc. does not contain the name *ὁ ἀντίχριστος*, to which it cannot be objected that the word is not found in

[1] xx. 4 sqq.
[2] v. 25 sqq.
[3] 1 John iii. 14.
[4] The thoroughly established exposition of John v. 25 sq. by Lücke, Meyer, etc., is attacked to no purpose by Hengstenb., who spiritualizes it.
[5] Cf. my Commentary on 1 John ii. 18.
[6] p. 203; cf. also Ewald, ii. 364 sqq.
[7] xvii. 11.
[8] xiii. 1 sqq., xvii. 3 sqq., xx. 10.
[9] xiii. 11 sqq., xx. 10.
[10] xvii. 11.
[11] 2 John 7.

the Gospel of John. For the Evangelist has no occasion to speak of antichrist; but the writer of the Apoc. could not leave antichrist unmentioned, because it is his express purpose to fully portray the judgment of the Lord upon the antichristian principle whose particular manifestations in the Apoc. are actually presented. [See Note VI., p. 88.]

A deeply penetrating difference in an apparent similarity is displayed also at xix. 13, where Christ is designated by the name *ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ*. Already the gen. *τοῦ θεοῦ* shows something of a departure from the mode of contemplation of the Apostle John: it is, however, utterly inconceivable to us, how the apostle who wrote John i. 1 sqq. could have described the Logos under any other form whatever. If, against this, we are reminded that the accomplishment of the incarnation of the Word is presupposed by the description in Rev. xix. 11 sqq., the distinctive character of the doctrinal view of the Apostle John is presented on only one side; for the apostle, who, of course, teaches that the Word (of God) has become man, nevertheless nowhere designates the divinely-human person of the Lord, even not in his heavenly state of exaltation, as the Word (Logos) of God. Hence Rev. xix. 13 seems to us to testify to a theological mode of thought which remarkably deviates from that of the Apostle John. (See Note VII., p. 88.)

An indirect testimony to the fact that the Apoc. was not composed by the Evangelist John is given, finally, by many particular *grammatical peculiarities*.[1] We believe that it is going too far when all the syntactical improprieties and grammatical irregularities which at first sight present themselves in the Apoc. mode of expression are utilized to show the distinction between the style of the Apostle John and that of the Apoc. If the question be concerning the coloring of Apocalyptic style, as a whole, and the character of the Apocalyptic mode of statement expressing itself in the whole structure of the language, which is in its nature conditioned by the nature of the subject, we need only refer to the fact[2] that the mode of thought which expresses itself in the mode of statement is foreign to the Evangelist; but then the simplicity and ruggedness, yea, even the grammatical incorrectness, besides the Hebraic tone of the Apocalyptic language, which appears to disdain the rules according to which man's discourse is directed, because it has to reveal the immutable glory of divine mysteries,[3] are no more to be made prominent in the sense that the answer depends upon particular improprieties of construction in the Apoc., which have no analogy in the Gospel and Epistles of John; but these irregularities indicate only the peculiar Apocalyptic mode of statement to which they owe their origin.

[1] Cf. Ewald, p. 66 sqq.; Lücke, p. 662 sqq. On the other side, Hengstenb., p. 423 sqq.

[2] See above.

[3] Cf., e.g., i. 4.

On the other hand, it seems to us, in a rhetorical respect, significant, when the writer of the Apoc. does not use such customary expressions in the writings of the Apostle John as are well adapted to the Apocalyptic style, or when, on the contrary, he has favorite expressions of his own, not current with the Evangelist John, and yet such as do not belong within the special sphere of apocalyptic literature. The most important consideration, finally, is when the same expressions are understood and fashioned by the writer of the Apoc. in a different way than by the apostle. In this last respect, most significant to us appears to be the manner which the idea of the Lord as the Lamb of God, derived from Isa. liii., and become the common property of the Christian Church,[1] is expressed by each. The expression of the Evangelist, *ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*, is nowhere found in the Apoc.: on the other hand, the apocalyptic *τὸ ἀρνίον* (*τὸ ἐσφαγμένον*) is nowhere found in John's Gospel or Epistles. When Hengstenb.,[2] however, says that even the word *ἀρνίον* is common to the Evangelist and the writer of the Apoc., and appeals to John xxi. 15, even though it be conceded that this passage was written by the Evangelist himself, the more significant becomes the constant distinction made in the designation of Christ. For, if the evangelist had used the term *ἀρνίον* of the lambs of Christ's flock, it would be the more inconceivable if the same writer in the Apoc. would constantly have used that expression of the Lord himself, but by an exception in his Gospel would have selected, in order to express this idea of the Lord, the term *ἀμνὸς* (*τοῦ θεοῦ*). [See Note VIII., p. 89.] The word *νικᾶν*, with respect to Christ and his believers, is common both to the Evangelist and the writer of the Apoc.; but, while the former constantly adds to it a definite object (*τὸν κόσμον, τὸν πονηρόν*), the latter, as a rule,[3] uses the word absolutely.[4] [See Note IX., p. 89.] The writer of the Apoc. thinks and writes *ψευδῆς*;[5] the Evangelist thinks and writes *ψεύστης*.[6] The former writes *Ἱερουσαλήμ*; the latter, *Ἱεροσόλυμα*, although the writer of the Apoc., in the formula Α and Ω, in the enumeration of xiii. 18, and in many particular expressions, follows the Greek mode. [See Note X., p. 89.] Here belongs, also, the use of the *ἰδού* in the Apoc., in distinction from the *ἴδε* by the Evangelist.

No less important than these linguistic variations, and partially connected therewith, is the circumstance that the entire series of expressions with which the Apostle John designates his peculiar fundamental conception of Christianity and its life, and which in his mouth, therefore, have such a

[1] Acts viii. 32; 1 Pet. i. 19.

[2] i. p. 204.

[3] Nevertheless, cf. xi. 7, xii. 11, xiii. 7.

[4] Cf Rev. v. 5, iii. 21, with John xvi. 33; 1 John ii. 13, v. 4 sq.

[5] ii. 2, xxi. 8.

[6] John viii. 44, 55; 1 John i. 10, ii. 4, 22, iv. 20, v. 10.

characteristic tone, since there sounds in them the true and clear mysticism of a profound spiritual realism, is far distant from the Apocalypse. Ideas and expressions like *ἡ ἀλήθεια, ποιεῖν τὴν ἀλήθ., εἶναι ἐκ τῆς ἀλήθ., ζωὴ αἰώνιος, ὁ κόσμος, ὁ πονηρός, ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, τὰ τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ εἶναι* and *γεννηθῆναι, τὰ τέκνα τοῦ διαβόλου, σκοτία* and *φῶς*, closely connected with which is that of *παῤῥησία*,[1] and others, the writer of the Apocalypse does not have. [See Note XI., p. 90.] But he has a phraseology of his own, not used by the Apostle John. The Apocalypse speaks of *ὑπομονή*, where the apostle would be expected to use *παῤῥησία* and *χαρά*. Expressions like *ἡ οἰκουμένη, οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἡ μαρτυρία Ἰησ., ὁ μάρτυς* applied to Christ, *ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ θεοῦ, ὁ πρωτότοκος τῶν νεκρῶν*, etc., the apostle does not use. [See Note XII., p. 90.]

The force of all that has thus been said concerning the indirect self-witness of the Apocalypse as to its author does not depend upon particular observations, but upon the impression of the book as a whole. If, then, to an unprejudiced mind, especially to one not biassed by any testimony of tradition, this impression is such that the composition of the Apocalypse by the apostle, i.e., the author of the Gospel and Epistles of John, is, at least, in the highest degree improbable, this indirect self-witness of the book is supported by just as decided direct testimony, as over against that of tradition, so far as it contradicts the indirect.

SEC. V. — THE AUTHOR (DIRECT TESTIMONY).

(*β*) The testimony of *tradition* concerning the origin of the Apocalypse.

As the most ancient witness for the authorship of the Apocalypse by the Apostle John, his pupil Polycarp dare not be cited. Hengstenb., who finds both in the Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians, and in the encyclical letter of the church at Smyrna concerning the martyrdom of their bishop, "numerous and, in part, very clear traces" of the Apocalypse, especially makes prominent a passage "which justifies us in regarding it among the gentler hints;" viz., Ep. to the Phil., ch. vi.: *Οὕτως οὖν δουλεύσωμεν αὐτῷ μετὰ φόβου καὶ πάσης εὐλαβείας καθὼς αὐτὸς ἐνετείλατο, καὶ οἱ εὐαγγελισάμενοι ἡμᾶς ἀπόστολοι, καὶ οἱ προφῆται, οἱ προκηρύξαντες τὴν ἔλευσιν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν· ζηλωταὶ περὶ τὸ καλὸν*, κ.τ.λ. ("Let us thus serve him with fear and all reverence, as he commanded, and as the apostles who preached the gospel to us, and the *prophets who proclaimed before the coming of the Lord*. Let us be zealous concerning what is good," etc.). The prophets, says Hengstenb., named after the Lord himself and the apostles, and prophesying of the coming of the Lord, belong to the New Testament. But they are not personally different from

[1] Cf. 1 John ii. 28, iv. 17.

the apostles: on the contrary, prophecy reached its summit in the bearers of the apostolate, and even John himself appears in the Apocalypse as the representative of the prophets.[1] But since here the prophets could come into consideration only through a generally known and acknowledged representative, and, with the exception of John in the Apocalypse, such an one is not present, we must, according to the words of Polycarp, regard the Apostle and Prophet John the author of this book. But upon the basis of Hengstenb.'s conception of the expression *οἱ προφῆται*, a much more natural result would be a direct testimony to the contrary. If the prophets meant by Polycarp, who are mentioned after the apostles, be of the New Testament, they must be distinguished from the apostles; perhaps John, the writer of the Apocalypse, also belonged to their number, — observe the plural *οἱ προφῆται*, — since we know that there were several prophetic writings which referred to the coming of the Lord, circulated in very ancient times, and, as the so-called Apocalypse of Peter, and the Shepherd of Hermas, not without ecclesiastical authority. But we are rather of the opinion[2] that Polycarp had in mind not Christian, but Old-Testament, prophets. That they are mentioned after the apostles, is necessary, because Polycarp begins with the Lord himself, to whom his apostles are added. What the apostle has said concerning the coming of the Lord belongs to their *εὐαγγελίσασθαι*; but the ancient prophets had already before proclaimed (*προκηρύξ*) that the Lord will appear for judgment. Upon this Old-Testament prophecy, Polycarp bases his earnest admonition, like Clement of Rome.[3]

Papias,[4] Hengstenb. claims as a witness to the composition of the Apocalypse by the Apostle John with the greater emphasis, as he regards him an immediate pupil of the apostle. The latter point is especially to be kept in view, as well because of the testimony which Papias actually gives — even though according to the documents offered only mediately — concerning the origin of the Apocalypse, as also because of the highly characteristic way in which that assumed relation of Papias to the Apostle John is stated by several Church Fathers to be a very important part of the ecclesiastical tradition concerning the Apocalypse. It is established by a testimony of Irenaeus, preserved by Eusebius,[5] that Papias composed only *one* writing; viz., five books under the title of *Λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσις*. In a fragment of this work,[6] expressing his predilection for oral tradition to be acknowledged trustworthy, he says: *ἐι δέ που καὶ παρηκολουθηκώς τις τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις ἔλθοι, τοὺς τῶν*

[1] i. 1, xxii. 6, 9, 16.

[2] With Lücke, p. 520 sqq.; Bleek, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1855, p. 181 sq.

[3] Ep. to the Corinthians, i., c. 23.

[4] Cf. Weiffenbach, *Das Papiasfragment*, Giessen, 1874. On the other side, Leimbach, *Das Papiasfragment*, Gotha, 1875.

[5] *H. E.*, iii. 39.

[6] In Eusebius, as cited.

πρεσβυτέρων ἀνέκρινον λόγους· τί Ἀνδρέας ἢ τί Πέτρος εἶπεν ἢ τί Φίλιππος ἢ τί Θωμᾶς ἢ Ἰάκωβος ἢ τὶ Ἰωάννης ἢ Ματθαῖος ἢ τις ἕτερος τῶν τοῦ κυρίου μαθητῶν, ἃ τε Ἀριστίων καὶ ὁ πρεσβύτερος Ἰωάννης, οἱ τοῦ κυρίου μαθηταὶ λέγουσιν ("If then any one having attended upon the elders came, I asked minutely after their sayings, — what Andrew or Peter or Philip or Thomas or James or John or Matthew or any other of the Lord's disciples said; which things Aristion *and the Presbyter* John, the disciple of the Lord, say"). From these words, Eusebius infers that Papias mentions two persons of the name John; viz., the apostle who is named in the rank with Andrew, Peter, Matthew, etc., and the John designated by the special title ὁ πρεσβύτερος, who of course with Aristion belonged, as well as the apostles mentioned, to the disciples of the Lord, i.e., to his immediate ear and eye witnesses, but yet in the most express manner is distinguished from the twelve. In the second place, from these words Eusebius infers, what he confirms by other passages of Papias not further quoted; viz., that Papias was an immediate pupil, not of the Apostle, but of the Presbyter John.[1] Neither of the facts presented by Eusebius, from the quoted words of Papias, is recognized by Hengstenb. when he ventures to assert that those words, just as they sound, could be understood otherwise than Eusebius has interpreted, and that therefore in them no distinction is to be made between the Apostle and the Presbyter John, as two separate persons. We maintain, on the other hand, that there is no need of opposing any thing further than a reference to the text, which seems so unambiguous that we regard any reference to the exegetical discussion cited from Eusebius as superfluous. What deceives Hengstb., so that he misunderstands the correct meaning of the words of Papias, is not only the fear of losing the testimony of Papias to the composition of the Apocalypse by the Apostle John, but also the dread of ascribing to Irenaeus a significant error in the same respect. When, e.g., Irenaeus writes, Ταῦτα δὲ καὶ Παπίας Ἰωάννου μὲν ἀκουστής, Πολυκάρπου δὲ ἑταῖρος γεγονώς, ἀρχαῖος ἀνήρ, ἐγγράφως ἐπιμαρτυρεῖ κ.τ.λ. ("To these things Papias, a hearer of John and a companion of Polycarp, an ancient man, bears witness in writing"),[2] he undoubtedly designates Papias as a hearer of the *Apostle* John: in the mouth of Irenaeus, the mere name Ἰωάννου ἀκ. can refer to no other person, especially since, in what precedes, it is expressly said of

[1] Παπ. τοὺς μὲν τῶν ἀποστόλων λόγους παρὰ τῶν αὐτοῖς παρηκολουθηκότων ὁμολογεῖ παρειληφέναι, Ἀριστίωνος δὲ καὶ τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου Ἰωάννου αὐτήκοον ἑαυτόν φησι γενέσθαι· ὀνομαστὶ γοῦν πολλάκις αὐτῶν μνημονεύσας ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῦ συγγράμασι τίθησιν αὐτῶν παραδόσεις ("Papias affirms that he received the sayings of the apostles from those who accompanied them, and he further asserts that he heard in person Aristion and the Presbyter John. Therefore, frequently mentioning them by name, he gives their traditions in his writings").

[2] B. V., xxxiii. 4.

the Apostle John, *Quemadmodum presbyteri meminerunt, qui Joannem discipulum Domini viderunt, audisse se ab eo, quemadmodum de illis temporibus docebat Dominus et dicebat* ("As the elders who saw John, the disciple of the Lord, related that they had heard from him how the Lord used to teach concerning those times[1] and say"). Then follows the well-known story of the mythical vines.[2] But with the same justice with which we refuse credit to this report of Irenaeus, upon the ground of what we know of our Lord's discourses through the Apostle John in his Gospel, must we also, on the ground of the testimony of Papias, charge Irenaeus with an error when he makes Papias a pupil of the Apostle John,[3] although he announces himself as a pupil of the Presbyter John.

The question now is, What did Papias testify concerning the Apoc.? We have three data whereby this question may be answered. 1. Towards the end of the fifth century, Andreas writes, in the introduction to his Commentary on the Apoc., that there was no need to speak at length concerning the inspiration of the book,[4] since not only Gregory and Cyril, but also the more ancient writers, Papias, Irenaeus, Methodius, and Hippolytus, testified to its trustworthiness.[5] Passages from these writers were also quoted in his commentary. That Papias, in express words, stated that the Apoc. was "trustworthy," or in what way he established this, Andreas does not say. Papias scarcely could have had already occasion to defend the Apoc. against attacks; but it is, on the contrary, highly probable that Andreas derived his testimony for the trustworthiness of the book from the circumstance that Papias and the other men mentioned quoted the Apoc. in their writings as Holy Scripture. Ἀξιόπιστον (trustworthy) is in Andreas the correlate for θεόπνευστος (inspired). At any rate, the important fact is established, that

[1] By "those times" are meant "the times of the kingdom when the just, rising from the dead, shall reign."

[2] "The days shall come in which vines shall grow, each having ten thousand branches, and in each branch ten thousand twigs, and in each true twig ten thousand shoots, and in each one of the shoots ten thousand clusters, and on every one of the clusters ten thousand grapes, and every grape when pressed will give five and twenty metretes of wine," etc.

[3] Hengstenb. is in error when he regards this as also the former opinion of Eusebius. In his *Chronikon*, there is related with historical fidelity, first, what Irenaeus states concerning the length of the life of the Apostle John; and, secondly, that Papias and Polycarp had been *regarded* as pupils of the Apostle John (ed. Aucher. ii. 69: "Joannem apost. usque ad Trajani tempora permansisse Irenaeus tradit. Post quem ejusdem auditores *agnoscebantur* Papias Hieropolitanus et Polycarpus," etc. "Irenaeus teaches that the Apostle John remained until the time of Trajan, after whom Papias of Hieropolis and Polycarp were *acknowledged* as his hearers"). Hence it does not follow that Polycarp was properly regarded such, and that Papias was actually a pupil of the Apostle John.

[4] περὶ τοῦ θεοπνεύστου τῆς βίβλου.

[5] τῶν ἀρχαιοτέρων Παππίου — ταύτῃ προσμαρτυρούντων τὸ ἀξιόπιστον.

Papias used the Apoc. as an inspired writing. But Hengstenb. very precipitately infers from this, that Papias therefore testifies to the composition of the Apoc. by the Apostle John. Andreas also has apparently presupposed this, but with the same want of foundation, and undoubtedly influenced likewise by the (erroneous) testimony of Irenaeus, who is mentioned together with Papias. That Papias has not expressly mentioned the Apostle John as the author of the Apoc., must also be inferred from the silence of Eusebius on this highly important subject, although the term *ἀξιόπιστον* of the Apoc. in the sense of Papias is perfectly justified in case he understands, as the composer of the book, that John whom he calls the presbyter; for this Presbyter John also, together with Aristion, Papias regards as, in addition to the apostles, a source of the pure doctrinal tradition, since he stood on an equality with them by being an immediate disciple of the Lord. 2. From the words of Papias, which Andreas quotes on Rev. xii. 7, nothing can be inferred concerning the question as to what John, Papias regards the author of the Apoc. It is even in the highest degree doubtful, whether that citation from the writing of Papias had any direct reference to Rev. xii. 7.[1] Andreas, in explaining what is said in Rev. xii. 7, according to the doctrine that the angels to whom God had intrusted a certain sovereignty over the world, had fallen from their estate because of pride and envy,[2] quotes *verbatim*,[3] for the two points of this doctrine, two passages of Papias: *ἐνίοις δὲ αὐτῶν, δηλαδὴ τῶν πάλαι θείων ἀγγέλων, καὶ περὶ τὴν γῆν διακοσμήσεως ἔδωκεν ἄρχειν· καὶ καλῶς ἄρχειν παρηγγύησε. καὶ ἔξῆς φησι· εἰς οὐ δέον (δὲ) συνέβη τελευτῆσαι τὴν τάξιν αὐτῶν* ("But to some of them, i.e., the divine angels of old, God both gave to rule over the arrangement of the earth, and he commissioned them to rule well. And he says, immediately after this: But it happened that their arrangement came to nothing"). According to its original meaning, the *ἐξῆς* must mean that the second declaration of Papias immediately follows the first; but Andreas notes it by a special form of quotation, because it is to his purpose to support by the authority of Papias his own exposition of Rev. xii. 7, according to the two sides of the doctrinal view on which this rests. Of a "battle-array" of angels, as Hengstenb. translates the word *τάξις*,[4] there is no mention in Papias; for, even though the reading were not *οὐ δεόν*, as the older MS. of Andreas has it,[5] but *οὐδέν*, the *τάξις* of the angels could be regarded in no other sense than that in which Andreas shortly before has spoken of the *ἔκπτωσις τῆς ἀγγελικῆς τάξεως*;[6] and just in reference

[1] Cf. Lücke, with whom also Bleek agrees, against Hengstenb.

[2] *πρώτη — ἐκ τώσει τῆς ἀγγελικῆς τάξεως.*

[3] *ἐπὶ λέξεως.*

[4] Cf. Rev. xii. 7: *πολεμῆσαι.*

[5] Lücke, p. 358 sq.

[6] Lücke has well compared with this what Justin M. writes in his *Apology*, ii. c. 5: *τὴν*

to this cites Papias, because he already teaches that the rank of angels, i.e., the high station given them by God, has changed to that which is not right, i.e., that the angels have fallen. In case now Papias had even applied Rev. xii. 7 to the doctrine of the angels, which is not clear from the quotation in Andreas, it is possible that he gave his judgment in connection with that passage. But, in this case, nothing further would result than what we have already heard from Andreas; viz., that Papias used the Apoc. because he acknowledged its trustworthiness. 3. Besides, from what Eusebius reports concerning the chiliastic expressions of Papias, it by no means follows that the latter used the Apoc. as a writing of the Apostle John.[1] Eusebius,[2] after citing some fabulous narratives concerning Papias, pretendedly taken from tradition,[3] says: *καὶ ἄλλα δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς ὡσὰν ἐκ παραδόσεως ἀγοάφου εἰς αὐτὸν ἥκοντα παρατέθειται, ξένας τέ τινας παραβολὰς τοῦ σωτῆρος καὶ διδασκαλίας αὐτοῦ, καὶ τινα ἄλλα μυθικώτερα· ἐν οἷς καὶ χιλιάδα τινά φησιν ἐτῶν ἔσεσθαι μετὰ τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν, σωματικῶς τῆς Χριστοῦ βασιλείας ἐπί ταυτησὶ τῆς γῆς ὑποστησομένης* ("The same person has set down other things as coming to him *from unwritten tradition:* among these, some strange parables and instructions of the Saviour, and some other things of a more fabulous nature. Among these he says that there will be a millennium after the resurrection from the dead, when the bodily reign of Christ will be established on this earth.") And Eusebius decides: *ἃ καὶ ἡγοῦμαι τὰς ἀποστολικὰς παρεκδεξάμενον διηγήσεις ὑπολαβεῖν, τὰ ἐν ὑποδείγμασι πρὸς αὐτῶν μυστικῶς εἰρημένα μὴ συνεωρακότα σφόδρα γάρ τοι σμικρὸς, ὧν τὸν νοῦν — φαίνεται* ("which things I think that he imagined, as if authorized by *the apostolic narratives*, not seeing at the same time the things mystically spoken in addition in the types; for it is evident that he was very limited in comprehension"). Hengstenb. assumes that Papias derived his chiliasm, not from the *παράδοσις ἄγραφος* (unwritten tradition),[4] as Papias himself asserts, according to the report of Eusebius, but from manuscript sources, viz., from the *αἱ ἀποστολικαὶ διηγήσεις* (the apostolic narratives); but since, if the apostolic narratives be understood as manuscript, "they could be regarded only especially as the Apoc.," this would prove the Apoc. to be an *apostolic* book. In order to destroy the plausibility

μὲν τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ τῶν ὑπό τὸν οὐρανὸν πρόνοιαν ἀγγέλοις, οὓς ἐπὶ τούτοις ἔταξε, παρέδωκεν. Οἱ δὲ ἄγγελοι παραβάντες τήνδε τὴν τάξιν, κ.τ.λ. ("Committed the care of men and of the things beneath the heaven to the angels whom he appointed over them. But the angels transgressing this appointment," etc.).

[1] Cf. Lücke, p. 532 sqq., against Hengstenb., p. 385 sqq.

[2] l. c.

[3] *παραδοξά τινα ἱστορεῖ καὶ ἄλλα ὡσὰν ἐκ παραδόσεως εἰς αὐτὸν ἐλθόντα* ("He relates, also, some other miraculous deeds as coming to him from tradition").

[4] Since this doctrine has its source solely in the Apoc., and is found nowhere independently of this book.

of this argument, there is scarcely need of the minuteness which Lücke does not shun; but it is sufficient simply to indicate that Papias himself, who does not mention a word of any apostolic narratives, justifies his chiliasm alone by the appeal to unwritten tradition; although Eusebius expresses his opinion (*ἡγοῦμαι*) that Papias derived his chiliasm by a misunderstanding of the narratives which Eusebius acknowledges as apostolic. But that Euseb. has counted the Apoc. among the apostolic narratives, Hengstenb. does not assert. If thereby, as is probable, he understood all evangelical literature, he has judged concerning Papias from a sound historical basis; for Justin M.,[1] and still more Irenaeus,[2] who himself appeals to Papias, and whom Eusebius mentions after the indorsement given chiliasm by Papias, develop their chiliastic opinions in no way from the Apoc. alone, but just as assuredly from passages in the old prophets and the Gospels. Papias, therefore, the pupil of the Apostle John, did not say that the Apoc. was composed by the Apostle John; but he is the most ancient witness concerning the book, as he used that which he regarded a writing of divine authority. In the sense of Papias, the *ἀξιώπιστον* of the Apoc. concurs well with its composition by the Presbyter John; and Papias could not have said what must have then led Eusebius into error, under the supposition that this Presbyter John actually wrote the Apoc.

The most ancient, and, because of his age, most important witness to the origin of the Apoc. from the Apostle John, is Justin Martyr. In the Dialogue with Trypho, written between the years 139 and 161, he says,[3] after he has treated of the one thousand years reign according to an O. T. passage,[4] *Καὶ ἔπειτα καὶ παρ' ἡμῖν ἀνήρ τις, ᾧ ὄνομα Ἰωάννης, εἷς τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐν ἀποκαλύψει γενομένῃ αὐτῷ χίλια ἔτη ποιήσειν ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ τοὺς τῷ ἡμετέρῳ Χριστῷ πιστεύσαντας προεφήτευσε, κ. τ. λ.* ("And then there was also with us a man whose name was John, who prophesied by a revelation that was made to him, that those who believed in our Christ would spend a thousand years in Jerusalem"). Eusebius[5] already has said of these words: *μέμνηται δὲ καὶ της Ἰωάννου ἀποκαλυψεως, σαφῶς τοῦ αποστόλου αὐτὴν εἶναι λέγων* ("He mentions also the Apocalypse of John, clearly saying that it is the Apostle's"). It is utterly inconceivable that Justin would have designated the Apostle to the Jew Trypho, just as the words run; it is also manifest from the nature and design of the writings of Justin, as also from the peculiar character of the Apoc., that we find in other places only a few allusions to it, and especially that in no other passage does he refer to the Apostle John as its author: there is consequently no reason for denying that the words *εἷς τῶν ἀποστόλων*

[1] *Dialog. with Trypho*, ch. 81.
[2] L. V. c. 33, 34.
[3] c. 81.
[4] Ps. xc. 4.
[5] *H. E.*, iv. 18.

τοῦ Χριστοῦ are Justin's, and esteeming them a gloss that has entered the text previous to the time of Eusebius.[1] Besides, the very brevity of Justin's words makes the impression that he expresses what, according to his knowledge, is the view concerning the composition of the Apoc. universally held in the Church. Whether he knew of any other tradition, we are not informed: he certainly spoke according to a tradition indubitable to himself. Nevertheless, the objective certainty of this tradition represented by Justin does not depend upon the fact that[2] the dialogue with Trypho was held at Ephesus, and that, too, scarcely a half-century subsequent to the composition of the Apoc.[3] For even if we ignore for the present the contrary testimony given by the Apoc. itself concerning its author, and its time of composition, the tradition that it was written towards the close of Domitian's reign rests upon no word of Justin; and, even though it should be conceded as at least highly probable that the confusion of the Apostle with the Presbyter John lies at the foundation of the tradition represented by Justin, it is in no wise inconceivable, that also in Ephesus, where the activity of the apostle for years forced the remembrance of the presbyter into the background, a tradition gained entrance which ascribed to the apostle a book whose esteem by the Church was constantly increasing.

The importance of Justin's testimony is increased by that of Irenaeus, who follows the tradition of the former concerning the composition of the Apocalypse by the Apostle John, but also adds something concerning the time of composition. Irenaeus, who in his youth had seen and heard Polycarp,[4] not only quotes many passages of the Apocalypse as a work of the Apostle John, but also writes,[5] in defence of the reading χξ′ (666) of Rev. xiii. 18: *ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς σπουδαίοις καὶ ἀρχαίοις ἀντιγράφοις τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ τούτου κειμένου, καὶ μαρτυρούντων αὐτῶν ἐκείνων τῶν κατ' ὄψιν τὸν Ἰωάννην ἑωρακότων, κ.τ.λ.* ("This number being found in all approved and ancient copies, and those who had seen John face to face testifying"). After he has treated of the doubtful meaning of that enigmatical number, he continues that it was not the intention of the seer that the meaning should at once be discerned: *εἰ γὰρ ἔδει ἀναφανδὸν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ κηρύττεσθαι τοὔνομα αὐτοῦ, δι' ἐκείνου ἂν ἐρρέθη τοῦ καὶ τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν ἑωρακότος. οὐδὲ γὰρ πρὸ πολλοῦ χρόνου ἑωράθη, ἀλλὰ σχεδὸν ἐπὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας γενεᾶς, πρὸς τῷ τέλει τῆς Δομετιανοῦ ἀρχῆς* ("For if it were necessary that his name should be distinctly revealed in the present time, it would have been announced by him who beheld the apocalyptic vision; for that was seen no very long time

[1] Against Rettig: *Über das erweislich älteste Zeugniss für die Aechtheit der Apok.*, Leipz. 1829; cf. Lücke, p. 549 sqq.

[2] Cf. Euseb., l. c.

[3] Hengstenb.

[4] Ed. ad Florin., in Euseb., *H. E.*, v. 20; Iren., *Opp.*, i. p. 822.

[5] L. V. c. 30; Euseb., v. 8.

since, but almost in our day, towards the end of Domitian's reign"). Irenaeus as "a true Catholic Churchman, in whom the Oriental and Occidental dogmatical and ethical traditions are concentrated,"[1] is of high importance, as he establishes the existence of the traditions which we have first found in Justin, and whereof there are still other traces from the second century,[2] and that, too, without having the opportunity to consider a contrary tradition concerning the origin of the Apocalypse. If we add further that the Alexandrians, Clement and Origen, and that Tertullian and Cyprian, without much reflection used the Apocalypse as a writing of the Apostle John, and that even Dionysius of Alexandria, who from the testimony of the book itself argues against its composition by the Apostle John,[3] does not depend upon a critical examination of the favorable tradition, Irenaeus appears as the most important witness of a very extensive and indubitably received account. Hengstb. also finds the strongest proof of the historical truth of this tradition in the testimony of those who had seen John. We concede that the μαρτυροῦντες cited by Irenaeus, which is decisive as to the correctness of the reading in Rev. xiii. 18, *in the sense of Irenaeus*, must be taken as a testimony for the composition of the book by the apostle; and further, that, according to the same sense, we must decide whether the self-witness of the Apocalypse be not directly contrary to that of Irenaeus and the tradition which he represents. But just because of this self-witness of the Apocalypse, we deny that the men who themselves actually saw John, and who were competent witnesses concerning the true reading of the Apocalypse, actually testified what Irenaeus undoubtedly presupposes, and Hengstenb. asserts; viz., that the Apostle John composed the book. The question is as to whether we are in any way to explain the misunderstanding of Ire-

[1] Lücke, p. 573.

[2] The fragment of Muratori (Wieseler, a. a. O.; cf. J. Van Gilse, *Disputatio de antiquissimo librorum sacrorum N. Foed. catalago, qui vulgo frag. Murat. appellatur*, Amst. 1852) quotes, at any rate, the Apoc. of John, even though the text is uncertain. According to Ewald (*Jahrb.* 1853, v. p. 185; cf. *Joh. Schriften*, ii. p. 349 sqq.), the fragmentist regards the Apoc. as a work of the Apostle John, but remarks that it is not generally acknowledged. But the latter statement Ewald bases upon the improbable conjecture that in the sentence, "Apocalypses etiam Joannis et Petri tantum recipimus, quam [quas?] quidam ex nostris legi in ecclesia nolunt" ("The Apocalypses of John and Peter also, we only receive, which some of ours are unwilling should be read in the church"), instead of the last word *nolunt*, it should read *volunt* (*wish*, intead of *are unwilling*). Like the fragmentist, undoubtedly, the rest, who used "the Apoc. of John," thought of the Apostle John. So Melito, who (according to Euseb., *H. E.*, iv. 26) wrote *Concerning the Devil, and the Apoc. of John;* Polycrates (*id.*); the churches of Lyons and Vienna, who in their letter (in Euseb., v. i.) employ the term Apoc., without designating the author; Theophilus, who "uses proofs from John's Apoc." (Euseb., iv. 24), and Apollonius, of whom Euseb. (v. 18) makes the same report.

[3] In Euseb., *H. E.*, vii. 25.

naeus, which must have occurred as certainly as the Apocalypse itself contradicts this chief witness, as well as whether we perhaps can find traces of another tradition deviating from Justin and Irenaeus, but not harmonizing with the declarations of this book.

That those μαρτυροῦντες gave their testimony orally to Irenaeus himself, is not only not said, but the present form μαρτυρούντων permits us, on the contrary, to think of witnesses still at hand, as well as those otherwise considered accessible, as, e.g., such men as in their writings mention the Revelation of John, and especially xiii. 18, men like Papias, whom Irenaeus erroneously considers as "having seen John face to face," and others who actually might have seen the apostle. In like manner, as from the superscription of 2 and 3 John (ὁ πρεσβύτερος), the tradition arose that these Epistles were written by the Presbyter, and not by the Apostle John,[1] the tradition of the composition of the Apocalypse by the Apostle John was the more readily attached to the name whereby he generally calls himself, as, in the remembrance of the Church, the presbyter must naturally have become, more and more, less prominent when compared with the apostle. The circumstance that both were active in the same neighborhood of Asia Minor, perhaps simultaneously, might have supported the mistake. Here lies the weak point in the otherwise so strong a bulwark of ecclesiastical tradition, advanced by such a man as Irenaeus, its leading representative. He is chargeable with two closely connected misunderstandings: he has made Papias a pupil of the Apostle John, and, without doubt chiefly upon the apparent authority of this man, who is placed by Andreas among the oldest witnesses concerning the Apocalypse, John the author of the Apocalypse is regarded the apostle; while, in *both* cases, the self-witness of Papias and of the writer of the Apocalypse contradict the statement of ecclesiastical tradition.

It would be strange, if in Christian antiquity there were no trace of a correct understanding of the declarations of the Apocalypse itself concerning its author, in opposition to the prevalent tradition, which, from a misunderstanding of the name of John in the Apocalypse, designates the apostle as its author, just as Euseb. expressly contradicts the statement (of Irenaeus) that Papias was an immediate pupil of the apostle, upon the ground of the very words of Papias. Such a trace is found not only in the rejection of the Apocalypse on the part of the Alogi, due to an antichristian mode of thought, nor only the judgment of the Roman presbyter Caius, resting upon the same grounds, that the Apocalypse was composed by Cerinthus and supposi-

[1] Cf. my Commentary, vol. ii. p. 460 sqq.

titiously ascribed to the Apostle John.[1] From the fact, that, in the Shepherd of Hermas, the Apocalypse is not used,[2] no conclusion dare be drawn concerning any opinion of Hermas as to the non-apostolic origin of the book,[3] especially as, on the other hand, it is probable that his entire writing, because of its apocalyptic nature, originated from the model of the Johannean Apocalypse, so that the Shepherd itself directly confirms what even without it stands fast; viz., that the Apocalypse, which Papias already regarded inspired, at the time of Hermas and in his circle enjoyed ecclesiastical authority. The silence of 2 Peter, emphasized by Lücke, is to be explained in the same way. For, if the Epistle be genuine, it was written before the Apocalypse; but if it were written in the beginning of the second century,[4] it is very readily conceivable that the blasphemers expressly mentioned[5] asked their unbelieving question because they saw the prophecies of the Apocalypse concerning the Lord's coming unfulfilled. But why is the Apocalypse, together with the four general Epistles (2 and 3 John, 2 Peter, and Jude) wanting in the Syriac translation, the *Peschito*, originating at the time of Irenaeus, about the year 200? The conjecture at least is at hand, viz., that, in the most ancient Syrian tradition, the apostolic origin of the Apoc. was no more received than that of 2 and 3 John: for only in later times, after the introduction of montanistic chiliasm, is the strange phenomenon explained, that the Apoc. is received as a work of the Apostle John and inspired, and yet classed "among the apocrypha," *ἐν ἀποκρύφοις*;[6] i.e., regarded inappropriate for public ecclesiastical use, yea, even such as should be expressly excluded from the ecclesiastical canon,[7] because of the fear of its being misunderstood and abused. More explicit in proof, are the verdicts of Dionysius of Alexandria, and Eusebius. The fact that Dionysius, the pupil and successor of Origen, reached his criticism of the book in his controversy against its chiliastic abuse, makes the calm, clear thoughtfulness of his criticism, based upon the nature of the Apoc., the more praiseworthy

[1] In Euseb., *H. E.*, iii. 28: Κήρινθος ὁ δι' ἀποκαλύψεων ὡς ὑπὸ ἀποστόλου μεγάλου γεγραμμένων τερατολογίας ἡμῖν ὡς δι' ἀγγέλων αὐτῷ δεδειγμένας ψευδόμενος ἐπεισάγει λέγων, μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐπίγειον εἶναι τὸ βασίλειον τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ παλιν ἐπιθυμίαις καὶ ἡδοναῖς ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ τὴν σάρκα πολιτευομένην δουλεύειν, κ.τ.λ. ("But Cerinthus, by means of revelations which he pretended were written by a great apostle, also falsely pretended to wonderful things, as if they were shown him by angels, asserting that after the resurrection there would be an earthly kingdom of Christ, and that the flesh, again inhabiting Jerusalem, would be subject to desires and pleasures").

[2] Cf. Lücke, p. 546, against Stern, who attempts to find a use of it in particular passages.

[3] Against Lücke.

[4] As Huther thinks.

[5] 2 Pet. ii. 3.

[6] Gregor. Nyss., in Lücke, p. 629.

[7] Cf. Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory of Nazianz., in Lücke, pp. 630, 632.

and important, when compared with the anti-chiliastic arbitrary decision of a Caius. Dionys.[1] stands entirely upon the basis of inner criticism: from the testimony of the Apoc. itself, he infers that the author could not be regarded as the Apostle John; and a comparison with the indubitable writings of the apostle he uses as a further proof of the view that the author of the Apoc. could not have been the well-known apostle. At the same time, Dionys. in no way denies that the author was a holy and inspired man, of the name of John.[2] It is manifest that Dionysius knows that his view is in conflict with the ecclesiastical tradition, which also his predecessors, Clement and Origen, follow; he also is acquainted with no tradition favorable to himself: his opposition, therefore, contains a testimony to the prevalence of the tradition concerning the composition of the Apoc. by the Apostle John. Yet hereby the importance which scientific criticism must attach to Dionys. is not diminished; for the main point is, if we otherwise may ask the ecclesiastical tradition concerning its foundation in truth, that we have in Dionysius a man just as churchly disposed as he is scientifically cultured, whom the ecclesiastical tradition did not hinder from understanding correctly the testimony of the Apoc. concerning itself, and from combining with the exegetical opposition to the chiliastic exegesis represented by Justin and Irenaeus, a critical opposition to the tradition concerning the composition of the Apoc. by the Apostle John, going hand in hand with that exegesis.[3] Important already is the fact that Dionysius, upon the ground of the Apoc. itself, protested against the tradition which misunderstood the book. He is supplemented by Eusebius the historian, since this writer also applies the testimony of Papias — only understood differently than by Irenaeus, i.e., in the sense of Papias himself — against the commonly received ecclesiastical tradition. Eusebius[4] is uncertain whether the Apoc. should be enumerated among the *ὁμολογουμένα* or the *νόθα*. What causes his vacillation is not the subjective criticism of Dionysius, but, as may be learned also from Book III. c. 39, especially the testimony of Papias; for in connection with his

[1] Cf. Euseb., *H. E.*, vii. 24, 25.

[2] *καλεῖσθαι μὲν οὖν αὐτὸν Ἰωάννην, καὶ εἶναι τὴν γραφὴν Ἰωάννου ταύτην, οὐκ ἀντερῶ· ἁγίου μὴν γὰρ εἶναι τινος καὶ θεοπνεύστου συναινῶ, οὐ μὴν ῥᾳδίως ἂν συνθοίμην τοῦτον εἶναι τὸν ἀπόστολου, κ.τ.λ.* ("I do not deny, therefore, that he was called John, and that this was the writing of a John; and I agree that it was the work also of some holy and inspired man. But I would not readily agree that this was the apostle," etc.).

[3] In the exegetico-critical treatment by Dionysius, the theological tendency is already to be recognized, against which men of the present day, like Hengstenb. and Auberlen, make resistance. Hence a deeply rooted principle comes to the surface in a characteristic way, in that Hengstenb. disparages Dionysius just in the degree that Lücke gives him the most just recognition.

[4] *H. E.*, iii. 25.

contradiction of the report (of Irenaeus) that Papias himself had heard the Apostle John, — although Papias calls himself a pupil of the Presbyter John, — Eusebius expresses the conjecture that John, the writer of the Apoc., might be identical with the Presbyter John.[1] The testimony, therefore, that the Apostle John wrote the Apoc., Eusebius can find nowhere in Papias. Papias has mentioned one called John as the author of the book; but he has nowhere expressly designated him as his teacher, for otherwise Eusebius would more confidently express his conjecture that the presbyter is actually its author. Yet for us, who with Dionysius, and in accordance with the testimony of the Apoc. itself, deny that the Apostle John is its author, the conjecture of Eusebius is the only one tenable. For, on the one hand, the apocalyptic John presents himself as a personality well known and esteemed in the circle of churches in Asia Minor; and, on the other hand, Papias, in speaking of the Apocalypse of "*the* John," points to an author by whose personality the trustworthiness of the book was assured. Of John Mark, whom Papias designates by the uniform name Mark, we cannot think: we know also, through Papias, of only two men by the name of John. If we cannot regard the apostle the author of the Apoc., we must abide by the probable conjecture of the Presbyter John. (See Note XIII., p. 90.)

What the ecclesiastical tradition says concerning the *time* and *place* of the composition of the Apoc. is of such a nature that thereby the error which lies at the foundation of the traditional statement concerning the person of the author is only presented on another side. All statements of ecclesiastical tradition concerning the time and place of composition are inseparably connected with that concerning the banishment of the Apostle John to the Island of Patmos; i. e., they proceed from an utter misunderstanding of Rev. i. 9, in like manner as the tradition concerning the composition of the book by the apostle is based upon the name of the author of the Apoc. The first to speak of a martyrdom of the Apostle John is Polycrates, who[2] writes: *ἔτι δὲ καί Ἰωάννης ὁ ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος τοῦ κυρίου ἀναπεσών — καὶ μάρτυς* ("John also, who rested on the bosom of the Lord — and martyr"). Undoubtedly he had in view Rev. i. 9, and follows the tradition that the apostle wrote the Apoc. Irenaeus is the first to make a statement concerning the time of origin of the Apoc., and that, too, in such a way as to designate manifestly, besides, the time of the apostle's banishment. In the passage already cited, he says the Apoc. was beheld already at the end

[1] *εἰκὸς γὰρ τὸν δεύτερον, εἰ μή τις ἐθέλοι τὸν πρῶτον, τὴν ἐπ' ὀνόματος φερομενην Ἰωάννου ἀποκάλυψιν ἑωρακέναι* ("It is proper to regard in the second, unless some one would prefer in the first class, the Apoc. called by the name of John").

[2] In Euseb., *H. E.*, iii. 31, v. 24.

of Domitian's reign. That this is the meaning of the words,[1] and that the view of Wetstein,[2] whom Böhmer [3] follows, viz., that *ἐωράθη* is to be referred to John himself,[4] is incorrect, follows partly from the clear correspondence between *τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν ἑωρακότος* and *ἐωράθη*, and partly from the fact that Irenaeus [5] reports that the Apostle John lived in the time of Trajan. The meaning of Irenaeus in presenting in contemporaneous connection the beholding of the revelation and the end of Domitian's reign, we can explain by the words of the perhaps contemporary Clement of Alexandria: [6] *ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τοῦ τυράννου τελευτήσαντος ἀπὸ τῆς Πάτμου τῆς νήσου μετῆλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν Ἔφεσον, κ. τ. λ.* ("After the tyrant was dead, he came from the Island of Patmos to Ephesus").[7] There can be no doubt that the tyrant of whom Clement speaks is Domitian, the persecutor of Christians, who, according to the representation of Eusebius, is portrayed as, in hatred of God, the successor of Nero.[8] Like Origen, Eusebius [9] also reports a tradition concerning the apostle's banishment to Patmos. The existence of such a tradition is just as certain as that of the tradition connected with it concerning the composition of the Apoc. by the Apostle John; but the unhistorical character of the former tradition is still more clearly established. The entire tradition of the banishment of the apostle is of itself in the highest degree doubtful, from the fact [10] that Hegesippus says nothing of it. He has given no report of any martyrdom of the Apostle John. For it is inconceivable that Eusebius, who [11] from Hegesippus gives an account of the Christian martyrs under Domitian, should have made no mention whatever of this apostle, in case he had found in Hegesippus any notice of his banishment; besides, even the way in which Eusebius, at the close of ch. xx., mentions the banishment of the apostle, affords positive proof that Hegesippus knew nothing of it.[12] In connection with this silence of Hegesipp., is the two-

[1] Cf. already Euseb., *H. E.*, iii. 18.

[2] *N. T.*, ii. 746.

[3] a. a. O. S., 30.

[4] *Eum sub exitum imperii Domitiani conspectum fuisse. Joannes id, quod non scripserat, postea saltem dixisset, cum diu post editum librum fuerit superstes.* Wetst. "That he was seen at the close of Domitian's reign. What he did not write, John, at least, afterwards said, since he was a survivor long after the book was published."

[5] L. II. c. 22; L. III. c. 3 (Euseb., *H. E.*, iii. 23).

[6] In Euseb., iii. 23.

[7] Cf. Origen on Matt. xx. 22 sqq.: *ὁ δὲ Ῥωμαίων βασιλεύς, ὡς ἡ παράδοσις διδάσκει, κατεδίκησε τὸν Ἰωάννην μαρτυροῦντα διὰ τὸν τῆς ἀληθείας λόγον εἰς Πάτμον τὴν νῆσον, κ.τ.λ.* ("But the Roman emperor, as tradition teaches, banished John, bearing witness by the word of truth, to the island of Patmos").

[8] Eusebius, iii. 17: *τελευτῶν τῆς Νέρωνος θεοεχθρίας τε καὶ θεομαχίας διάδοχον ἑαυτὸν κατεστήσατο* ("At length established himself as the successor of Nero's hatred and war with God").

[9] iii. 20; cf. c. 18.

[10] Cf. Bleek, *Beitr.*, p. 199; *Vorles.*, p. 158 sq.

[11] *H. E.*, iii. 20.

[12] *τότε δὴ οὖν καὶ τὸν ἀπόστολον Ἰωάννην ἀπὸ*

fold circumstance that the tradition itself, as definitely presented since Irenaeus, not only betrays by its constant growth, as well as by its discordancy, the uncertainty of its historical foundation; but also by its reference to Rev. i. 9, indicates the source whence, by the misunderstanding of those words of the Apoc., it has originated. Already Irenaeus says that the Apoc. was seen "at the close of the reign of Domitian," notwithstanding the fact that the book itself clearly states that it was composed before the fall of Jerusalem. The end of Domitian's reign occurred in the year 96, in which Nerva followed. The tradition, of which Eusebius gives a report in his Chronicle,[1] therefore puts the banishment of the Apostle, and the beholding of the revelation, in the year 95. Clement of Alexandria[2] reports further, that, after the death of Domitian, the apostle returned to Ephesus, — under Nerva, as the tradition is explained in Eusebius;[3] for just as the banishment of the apostle is placed under Domitian, of whom it is known that he manifested his hatred of Christians by sentences of banishment, so also the return of the apostle is placed under Nerva, concerning whom it is known that he recalled those banished by Domitian.[4] But at the same time, with Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian mentions a martyrdom of the apostle previous to the banishment to Patmos:[5] "Habes Romam ubi Apostolus Joannes, posteaquam in oleum igneum demersus nihil passus est, in insulam relegatur" ("You have Rome, where, after the Apostle John suffered nothing when plunged into boiling oil, he is banished to an island"). He does not need, therefore, the chronological relation between the "in oleum igneum demersus," and the "in insulam relegatur," in order to mark this the more accurately. But how tradition received Tertullian's intimation, and still further elaborated it, is to be seen in Jerome, who,[6] with express reference to Tertullian, nevertheless reports what the latter did not say: "Refert autem Tertullianus, quod *a Nerone* missus in ferventis olei dolium *purior* et *vegetior* exiverit, etc." ("Tertullian moreover relates, that, being cast *by Nero* into a vessel of boiling oil, he came forth *purer* and more *vigorous*"). Like Irenaeus,[7] he puts the banishment of the apostle to Patmos, and the composition of the Apoc., under Domitian.[8] It cannot be said

τῆς κατὰ τὴν νῆσον φυγῆς τὴν ἐπὶ τῆς Ἐφέσου διατριβὴν ἀπειληφέναι, ὁ τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν ἀρχαίων παραδίδωσι λόγος. Cf. also c. 18. "It was then also that the Apostle John returned from his banishment at Patmos, and took up his abode at Ephesus, as the account of the ancients delivers it to us."

[1] 1. p. 80.

[2] Cited above.

[3] *H. E.*, iii. 20.

[4] Euseb., cited above.

[5] *De Praesert. Haeret.*, c. 36.

[6] *Adv. Jovinian*, i. 26.

[7] Cf. also Victorinus, d. 303, who, in his Commentary on the Apoc., adds: "Condemned to the *mines*." *Bibl. max. Patrum*, Paris, T. I. p. 569.

[8] *De vir. illustr.*, c. 9.

that Tertullian, Victorinus, and Jerome contradict the tradition represented by Clement of Alexandria and others: they only make its growth and formation visible. Epiphanius, however, testifies to a manifestly contradictory tradition,[1] by putting the banishment to Patmos, and[2] the beholding of the revelation, in the time of the Emperor Claudius.[3] If we ask, finally, whence the tradition of the apostle's exile originated, we can derive the answer from the fact that Origen,[4] after stating, upon the foundation of tradition, that the Roman Emperor had banished the apostle to Patmos, in order to confirm this tradition appeals to Rev. i. 9, as the apostle's own words: *διδάσκει δὲ τὰ περὶ τοῦ μαρτυρίου ἑαυτοῦ Ἰωάννης, μὴ λέγων τίς αὐτὸν κατεδίκησε, φάσκων ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει ταῦτα* ("John teaches the facts concerning his martyrdom, not saying who sentenced him, relating in the Apoc. as follows") — then comes the citation — *καί ἔοικε τὴν ἀποκαλύψιν ἐν τῇ νήσῳ τεθεωρηκέναι* ("and he seems to have beheld the Apoc. on the island").

The ecclesiastical tradition, in its prevalent form, contains three inseparable points: that the Apostle John is the author of the Apoc.; that he beheld the revelation on the Island of Patmos; and that this occurred under Domitian. Against all three points, even against the second,[5] stands the decisive self-witness of the Apoc., from the misunderstanding of which this prevalent tradition has developed. But there are also traces of a different tradition, and of a more correct understanding of the expressions of the Apoc. itself. Hence it is the right and duty of criticism to assert that the Apoc. was *not* written by the Apostle and Evangelist John; while, at the same time, it can express only the probable conjecture that John, the author of the Apoc., must be identical with the presbyter of that name. [See Note XIV., p. 91.]

SEC. VI. — THE CANONICAL AUTHORITY AND ECCLESIASTICAL USE OF THE APOCALYPSE.

Full *canonical authority* belongs to the Apoc. only if it were written by an apostle, and, if because of its origin through divine inspiration it were of the same truly normative character as the other undoubtedly genuine writings of the apostle. In both respects the Apoc. appears deficient, yet not to such extent that it must have its place outside of the ecclesiastical canon: *deutero-canonical* authority, but nothing less, belongs to it.

It does not profess to be the work of an apostle, either truly or falsely; but it was still written in the immediately apostolic times, before the

[1] *Haer.*, li. 12.

[2] c. 33.

[3] Cf. Lücke, p. 806 sqq., who cites still other traces of the uncertainty of the tradition.

[4] Above cited.

[5] Cf. on Rev. i. 9.

destruction of Jerusalem, and that, too, by a man who, according to the throughout credible testimonies of the most ancient tradition, himself had seen and heard the Lord, and who, when he wrote his book, filled a prominent place in the Church. In the degree that the ancient Church established itself in the opinion that John the author of the Apoc. was identical with John the Apostle and Evangelist, it yielded to an error which already in ancient times contradicted ecclesiastical witnesses, and even at present has almost completely suppressed a gift of critical science bestowed upon the Church in ever-increasing fulness. But beneath the error lies the truth, necessary and sufficient for its deutero-canonical authority, that it was composed by an apostolic man.

Yet the book would not have been received into the canon if the Church had not found that it was trustworthy and inspired. The claim which it makes in this respect, that certainly something truly prophetic and resting on a divine revelation is reported, has been acknowledged by the ancient Church as well established; and the self-witnessing Spirit, controlling the Church in theological science and Christian life, has constantly confirmed, in essentials, this ancient judgment, but at the same time modified it with increasing clearness and confidence. The more the holy art of the exposition of Scripture has attained an insight into the structure of the Apoc., and the meaning of particular expressions, the less can the Church incur the temptation of regarding the book as a collection of predictions,[1] and the less will the judgment of those who pronounce the Apocalyptic prophecy the most glorious fruit of apostolic endowment, and the inspiration of the author of the Apoc. the richest and purest work of God's Spirit, be indorsed by the Church. Christian science and life will always experience the more certainly that God's Spirit, who spake in the Apostle John as well as in the author of the Apocalypse, found in the former a nobler vessel than in the latter; i.e., while the Apoc. is canonical, it is, nevertheless, deutero-canonical.

The proof for this lies partly in what has already been cited,[2] and partly in the exposition of details. There are especially three points to be emphasized, as of the highest importance for the ecclesiastical use of the Apoc.

1. If the explanation given below of xiv. 4 be correct, the writer presents a view of marriage not consistent with scriptural ethics. He is, of course,

[1] This is the inheritance of unchurchly and unscientific sects. Only a fanatic could say that Bengel derived from an inner revelation the limitation of the *non-chronus* (x. 7) to 1036 years. Cf. *Prüfung der apokalypt. Zeitrechnung.*, Stuttg. 1840, p. 74. The author confidently expects, in the year 1950, the *parousia*, for which Bengel had designated the year 1836.

[2] Cf. especially sec. 2.

far removed from the heretical prohibition of marriage;[1] but, in his Christian advice, he speaks differently from the Apostle Paul.[2] The author of the Apoc. errs by regarding *all* sexual intercourse impure, and therefore in assigning those believers who abstain entirely therefrom a prominent place above the other saints.

2. His conception of the one thousand years' reign has no sufficient support in the analogy of Scripture. The N. T. doctrine, on the one hand, mentions that the general resurrection of the dead, and the final judgment, will occur at the *parousia*,[3] but at the same time distinguishes several acts in that catastrophe; viz., first, the resurrection of the righteous,[4] and afterwards the resurrection of all others. Both resurrections, together with the final judgment, occur ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ. But to the author of the Apoc. the distinction between the several acts in the final catastrophe appears so elaborated, that between the first and the second resurrection there lies a period comprised within an earthly limit (one thousand years), wherein there occurs an earthly rule of believers no more earthly, i.e., those who have arisen from the dead; and, at the end thereof, the saints, no longer earthly nor to be touched by any enemy, are attacked in the earthly Jerusalem by diabolic and human enemies, who then fall into eternal ruin. These expressions, if we deny their ideal, poetical nature, are self-contradictory, and opposed to the analogy of Scripture. But even what is at least contained in his poetical presentation as the very meaning of the author of the Apoc. — viz., the admission of a diabolical activity against the kingdom of God, immediately before the second resurrection — extends beyond the limits of Christian thought given by the analogy of Scripture.

3. That the author of the Apoc. sees the antichristian power embodied in the Roman Empire, is a natural limitation: this is the occasion for the error that this embodiment will be the last before the *parousia*.[5] But the chronological designation in xvii. 10 sq. not only has proved to be incorrect, but is with difficulty to be reconciled with the Lord's warning.[6] It is essentially of the same nature as the expectation expressed a few years later, in 4th Esdras, that, with the last of the Flavians, the Roman Empire will perish.[7] This last point, which lies in the proper centre of the Apocalyptic

[1] 1 Tim. iv. 3.

[2] 1 Cor. vii. 38.

[3] Matt. xxv. 36 sqq.

[4] Luke xiv. 14; 1 Cor. xv. 23: οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ; i.e., those actually belonging to Christ, and acknowledged by him as his own. Meyer to the contrary.

[5] Cf. Tertullian, *Ad Scap.*, c. 2: "Cum toto Romano imperio, quosque seculum stabit, *tamdiu enim stabit*." "With the entire Roman empire, as long as the world will stand, *for it will stand so long*."

[6] Acts i. 7.

[7] Cf. Ewald, *Gesch. d. V. Israel.*, vii. 74.

prophecy, alone determines already the deutero-canonical authority of the book, even though the two other points could be obviated. Yea, in itself it might be possible that the idea is that Satan, in the last moment before his final sinking into condemnation, undertakes yet once more an outward, as well as a mad, attack against the kingdom of Christ.

The *ecclesiastical use* of the Apoc. can only aim at communicating to congregations the sure results of the learned exegesis already existing in the Church. False, and serving a deceptive edification,[1] is every ecclesiastical exposition and application having any contents that are exegetically incorrect.[2] The ecclesiastical exposition should rather, on its part, be opposed to the widely spread, superstitious abuse of the book.

The question for us now is not with respect to the general foundation of N. T. doctrine upon which the Apoc. stands, but concerning what is peculiar to the book. The Apoc. is the most eloquent record of Christian hope, and of the fidelity, patience, and joy springing from hope. Since the Lord has risen from the dead, and ascended into heaven, he will also return to awaken and judge the dead. Christian hope, bestowed with faith in the Lord, holds with inner necessity to his *parousia*. The prophecy of this *parousia* is, therefore, not only every prophecy concerning Christ,[3] but also the point towards which the preaching of Christ infallibly tends. The peculiar theme of the Apoc., therefore, grows from the living fulness of the gospel; and the Apoc. offers splendid models,[4] clearly defined, for the ecclesiastical explanation and application of every prophetical, fundamental thought. The patient hope of congregations will also be exercised and strengthened by the holy art with which the Apocalyptic prophet represents the signs and preparations for the *parousia*. It is incorrect to directly refer the particular visions of seals, trumpets, and vials, to particular events in secular, ecclesiastical, or governmental history; but it is correct to regard the entire course of temporal things as tending, according to God's order, to an eternal fulfilment; and also correct are the beautiful words of Bengel,[5] that we should read the Apoc. "as *candidates for eternity*." The long series of preparations, always beginning anew, contains in itself the corrective to the author's chronological error that the Lord's *parousia* was at hand.

[1] To speak with Calvin on 1 Cor. viii. 10, a *ruinosa edificatio*.

[2] Hence the "vow concerning the homiletical treatment of the Apoc.," by A. F. Schmidt (Stuttgart, 1867), is entirely useless.

[3] Rev. x. 7.

[4] Chs. ii. and iii.

[5] *Ordo tem.*, p. 326.

Notes on the Introduction.

I., p. 57.

On the other hand, Davidson (*Introduction to N. T.*, iii. 559): "He does not take the title *apostle*, because, carrying with itself an idea of official authority and dignity, it was foreign to his natural modesty. Neither in his Gospel nor in any of his Epistles does he call himself by that high appellation. He does not even take the name of John in them, but reveals himself in other ways as their author. And, that the title *servant of Jesus Christ* is more appropriate here than *apostle*, is obvious from the nature of the communication. In the Gospel he speaks of himself as *the disciple whom Jesus loved*, for then he stood in an intimate relation to Christ as the Son of man appearing in the form of a servant; but in the present book Christ is announced as the glorified Redeemer, who should come quickly to judgment, and John is his *servant*, intrusted with the secrets of his house. Well, therefore, did it become the writer to forget all the honor of his office, and be abased before the Lord of glory. The resplendent vision of the Saviour had such an effect upon the seer, that he fell at the Saviour's feet as dead; and it was, therefore, natural for him to be clothed with humility, and to designate himself *the servant of Jesus Christ, the brother and companion of the faithful in tribulation.*"

II., p. 58.

The inference of our author is in both cases unnecessary. Cf. Alford (*Proleg.*, vol. iv. c. viii. § i. 86): "The Apocalyptic writer is simply describing the heavenly city as it was shown to him. On the foundations are the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb. Now, we may fairly ask, what reason can be given why the beloved apostle should not have related this? Was he, who with his brother James sought for the highest place of honor in the future kingdom, likely to have depreciated the apostolic dignity just because he himself was one of the twelve? and, on the other hand, was he whose personal modesty was as notable as his apostolic zeal, likely, in relating such high honor done to the twelve, to insert a notice providing against the possible mistake being made of not counting himself among them?"

III., p. 63.

Diversities of subjects and experience could readily account for the diversities of style and tone. By a similar argument, it might be shown that the Luther who wrote the charming letter to his little boy Hans, concerning the children's heaven, could not be the same who flung defiance at the Pope in the Smalcald Articles. The Homeric controversy ought to furnish a warning concerning the dangers of pressing diversities to an extreme, where learned critics, after agree-

ing that those writings come from a number of distinct hands, fall at once into irreconcilable confusion, when, on the ground of internal evidence, they endeavor to assign the various parts to their several supposed authors. All the mildness of John in the Gospel and Epistles does not conceal the fact that he was one of the Boanerges (Mark iii. 17; cf. Luke ix. 54, Mark ix. 38). Even the fiery disposition, so tempered with mildness, as exhibited in the Gospel, could be employed in the service of the Redeemer, when the hour came for a change of contemplation from the Saviour in his humiliation, and the very beginning of his glorified life as exhibited on earth, to the beatific vision of unspeakable things in heaven. The sympathetic nature of the apostle immediately reflects the change in his Lord, who is no longer the Man of sorrows, but the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Lamb, indeed slain, but now seen worshipped by the heavenly hosts.

IV., p. 64.

Schultze (Zöckler's *Theol. Handbuch*, i. 423 sq.): "The distinctions that have been made conspicuous, the Hebraizing style of the Apoc., its vivacious, ardent, imaginative mode of expression, its strikingly sensitive mode of thought, its cabalistic numerical symbolism, — all this, so far as it is established, is explained by the entirely different character necessarily distinguishing a prophetic-apocalyptic from an historical statement. . . . The distinction is similar to that which exists between the historical and prophetical sections in Isaiah, Daniel, and Zechariah."

V., p. 65.

Gebhardt (*The Doctrine of the Apocalypse*, p. 402) finds "in John v. 25 the first resurrection, the resurrection of the just; and in John v. 28, 29, the general resurrection to judgment," by regarding the resurrection from spiritual death "now," as potentially, or germinally, the first resurrection. The one "is the completion;" the other, "the beginning, or the germ."

VI., p. 66.

But if such inconsistency as the author here maintains could be established, it would have a result more far-reaching than the simple establishment of the diversity of writers. If there is no real antagonism between books that are equally the product of divine revelation, no failure to reconcile seeming contradictions is valid in this connection as an argument.

VII., p. 66.

Davidson (*Introduction*, iii. 555): "Yet, in the First Epistle of John, Christ is designated ὁ λόγος τῆς ζωῆς, which is nearly synonymous with ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ."

Alford (*et supra*, ¶ 110): "I may leave it to any fair-judging reader to decide, whether it be not a far greater argument for identity, that the remarkable designation ὁ λόγος is used, than for diversity, that, on the solemn occasion described in the Apoc., the hitherto unheard adjunct τοῦ θεοῦ is added."

VIII., p. 67.

Alford (*Prolegomena*, ¶ 114): "The word ἀρνίον, which designates our Lord twenty-nine times in the Apoc., only elsewhere occurs in John xxi. 15, not with reference to him. But it is remarkable that John i. 29, 36, are the only places where he is called by the name of a lamb; the word ἀμνός being used, in reference, doubtless, to Isa. liii. 7 (Acts vii. 32), as in one other place, where he is *compared* to a lamb (1 Pet. i. 19). The Apocalyptic writer, as Lücke observes, probably chooses the diminutive, and attaches to it the epithet ἐσφαγμένον, for the purpose of contrast to the majesty and power which he has to predicate of Christ; but is it not to be taken into account, that this personal name, *the Lamb*, whether ἀμνὸς or ἀρνίον, whether with or without τοῦ θεοῦ, is common only to the two books?" Cremer (*Lexicon*, on ἀρνίον): "In the Apocalypse, it is the designation of Christ, and, indeed, of the exalted Christ; first, in Rev. v. 6, where the term, especially in the diminutive form, appears to have been selected, primarily, for the sake of the contrast with ver. 5. The reason why the lion, which has overcome, presents himself as a lamb, is that he gained his victory in that form." So Gebhardt (p. 112), who adds: "Possibly because the writer had once introduced Christ by it, for reasons of authorship he continues its use. It may be, also, that he preferred it, because he desired continually to bring into prominence the contrast between the appearance of Christ and his real importance."

IX., p. 67.

Alford (¶ 112): "But surely this is the very thing which we might expect. The νικᾷν τὸν κόσμον, τὸν πονηρόν, αὐτούς, etc., — these are the details, and come under notice while the strife is proceeding, or when the object is of more import than the bare act; but when the *end* is spoken of, and the final and general victory is all that remains in view, nothing can be more natural than that he, who alone spoke of νικᾷν τὸν κόσμον, τὸν πονηρόν, αὐτούς, should also be the only one to designate the victor by ὁ νικῶν."

X., p. 67.

Yet both forms are used by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and Paul. In the Apoc. it occurs but three times, and in this form is better adapted to poetry.

XI., p. 68.

Of these expressions, the abstract ἡ ἀλήθεια of the Gospel naturally is replaced by the concrete of the Apoc., as the very change in the character of subject suggests; ποιεῖν τὴν ἀληθειαν occurs but once in the Gospel, and once in the Epistle; εἶναι ἐκ τῆς ἀλήθ. occurs but once in the Gospel, though twice in the First Epistle; and ἐκ θεοῦ γεννηθῆναι, but once in the Gospel, though frequently in the First Epistle.

XII., p. 68.

Peculiarities of diction are to be expected, yet Davidson (p. 578 sq.) notes on ἡ οἰκουμένη: "Denoting, as it appears to do, the Roman Empire in the Apoc., it was not suited to the topics discussed in John's acknowledged writings. It occurs in the LXX. as the representation of תֵּבֵל; and, in consequence of the peculiarly Hebraistic character of the Apocalyptic diction, it is found in the book before us." On ὑπομονή: "It is not surprising to see it in the Apoc., because the leading object of the writer was to inculcate patient endurance of afflictions and persecutions, and to comfort his readers with the hope of release. The Gospel and Epistles of John are occupied with topics which did not require or admit the term," etc.

XIII., p. 80.

The entire argument of Düsterdieck on the external evidence is unsatisfactory, and its careful study can have no other effect than to demonstrate its weakness. See the elaborate arguments on the other side in Alford, Davidson, and Stuart, as also in briefer compass in Lange and Farrar (*Early Years of Christianity*, p. 405). Cf. also Gebhardt, 1–4. The whole is well summed up by Schultze (Zöckler's *Handbuch*): "The most ancient historical witnesses testify that this John was the Apostle; as Polycarp, according to Irenaeus, v. 20. Papias appealed, in support of his chiliasm, to the apostolical διηγήσεις; Melito of Sardis wrote an explanation; Theophilus, Apollonius, Polycrates, — all witnesses from Asia Minor, whither the book was sent, — acknowledge it as Johannean, without specially emphasizing that the apostle was the composer, since at that time (as Düst. concedes) this was undoubted. The most important witness is Justin (*c. Tr.*, 81), who lived long in Asia Minor. Iren. (v.) speaks of the many ancient MSS. which would not have existed if the book had not an apostolic origin. Many references occur to it also in the Epistle to the church at Lyons. Contemporaneously with this, the Can. Mur. says that the apostle wrote letters to the seven churches; in connection, indeed, with the remark, 'Some of us are unwilling that they be read in church.' For similar reasons, it was translated in the Peschito. But the apostolic origin was not thereby called into question; for, concerning this, Clemens Alex., Origen, Tertullian, Cyprian, Hippolytus in Ephr. Syr., speak with one voice. Previous to Euse-

bius, the apost. origin of the Apoc. was rejected only by Marcion, the Alogi (which signifies little), and the presbyter Caius; the latter only, as an anti-chiliast, maintaining that Cerinthus had forged it as though coming from the apostle. In like manner, Dionysius of Alexandria doubted it, because much in the book is designated as unreasonable. He holds, therefore, that since also, both in contents and style, it is distinguished from the Gospel, and as there were two Johns, it might have been written by the other John; in entire opposition, therefore, to his teacher Origen. Even apart from the obscurity concerning the Presbyter John, in no way cleared up, this view of Dionysius is not tradition, but only conjecture. The Tübingen critics are entirely right in maintaining that the apostolical origin of no book is so well attested, throughout all antiquity, as that of this."

XIV., p. 83.

Trench (*On the Epistles to the Seven Churches*): "The unprejudiced reader will hardly be persuaded that St. John sets himself forth here as any other than such a constrained dweller at Patmos; one who had been banished thither 'for the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ.' Those modern interpreters who find in these words no reference to any such suffering for the truth's sake, but only a statement on the writer's part, that he was in the Isle of Patmos for the sake of preaching the word of God, or, as others, for the sake of receiving a communication of the word of God, refuse the obvious meaning of the words, — which, moreover, a comparison with vi. 9, xx. 4, seems to me to render imperative, — for one which, if it also may possibly lie in them, has nothing but this bare possibility in its favor. It is difficult not to think that these interpreters have been unconsciously influenced by a desire to get rid of the strong testimony for St. John's authorship of the book, which lies in the consent of this declaration with that which early ecclesiastical history tells about him; namely, that for his steadfastness in the faith of Christ, he was by Domitian banished to Patmos, and only released at the accession of Nerva."

Gebhardt (p. 10): "I decide for the interpretation, justified by Rev. xx. 10, that the author came to Patmos as a martyr; whether as a captive, or more probably as one banished, which was in accordance with the practice of Rome in Domitian's time, — and which also agrees with one form of tradition, — or whether as a fugitive, which another tradition asserts, cannot with certainty be decided from the tribulation of i. 9, and the 'leading into captivity' of xiii. 10, or from the general contents of the book."

Schultze: "With respect to time and place, the historical tradition is established by the book; according to Ir. v. 30, during the banishment of the apostle to Patmos, under Domitian: so also Clement of Alexandria, in Euseb. iii. 23; Origen on Matt. xx.; Jerome, *Cat.* 9. Most involved in controversy is the time, since its determination depends upon the interpretation of the entire book. . . .

Sure indications in the Epistles point rather to the time of Domitian. The state of the churches is one inwardly more thoroughly established; one is at the head (ἄγγελος, not = angel). The erroneous teachers (xvi. 13) are like those in the Epistle of Jude; only with the distinction that they have come forward, not only for the first time, but for a long time already have pursued their course. There were actually Nicolaitanes (not a symbolical designation and translation of Balaam), but not in the time of Paul. In Isa. xi. 8, Jerusalem is compared with Sodom, because, like the latter, it has been destroyed; and in xi. 1, it is not the temple at Jerusalem, but the sanctuary at the end of time, that is meant. . . . After the destruction of the earthly Jerusalem, the last of the apostles, as absolutely the last pillar of the church at Jerusalem, beholds, with the eyes of his spirit opened by the invisible Head of the Church, the future of the heavenly Jerusalem, and, with this, the victory of the Church of Jesus Christ, and its faith over the world and all persecuting powers."

So also Davidson: "We therefore assume A. D. 96, as the most probable date of John's residence in Patmos." Alford: "With every desire to search and prove all things, and ground faith upon things thus proved, I own I am quite unable to come to Lücke's conclusions, or to those of any of the maintainers of the Neronic or any of the earlier dates. The book itself, it seems to me, refuses the assignment of such times of writing. The evident assumption which it makes of long-standing and general persecution (ch. vi. 9) forbids us to place it in the very first persecution, and that only a partial one. The undoubted transference of Jewish temple emblems to a Christian sense (ch. i. 20), of itself, makes us suspect those interpreters who maintain the literal sense when the city and temple are mentioned. The analogy of the prophecies of Daniel forbids us to limit to individual kings the interpretation of the symbolic heads of the beast. The whole character and tone of the writing precludes our imagining that its original reference was ever intended to be to mere local matters of secondary import. These things being then considered, I have no hesitancy in believing, with the ancient Fathers and most competent witnesses, that the Apoc. was written πρὸς τῷ τέλει τῆς Δομετιανοῦ ἀρχῆς, i. e., about the year 96 or 97." Lange, Stuart, and Farrar maintain the Neronian period. Harnack, in *Encyclopædia Britannica*, suggests that "the Apoc. was written under Galba, but afterwards underwent revisions under Vespasian, about 75–79, and perhaps in Domitian's reign of terror, 93–96."

Ἀποκάλυψις Ἰωάννου.

This title is according to the evidence (C. 2, al. b. Wetst.; also ℵ [T., Tr., W. and H.]), and, since it is derived simply from Rev. i. 1, 4, 9, the oldest. Further statements concerning the author run: *ἀποκ. Ἰωάννου τοῦ θεολόγου* (Elz.), *καὶ εὐαγγελιστοῦ — ἣν ἐν Πάτμῳ τῷ νήσῳ ἐθεάσατο — ἡ ἀποκ. τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰωάννου τ. θεολ. — ἀποκ. τοῦ ἁγίου ἐνδοξοτάτου ἀποστόλου καὶ εὐαγγελιστοῦ παρθένου ἠγαπημένου ἐπιστηθίου Ἰωαννου θεολόγου* (cf. Wetst., Griesb., Matthäi).

CHAPTER I.

[Ver. 1, ℵ*, W. and H., *ἰωάνει.*] — Ver. 2. The *τε* after *ὅσα* (Elz., Ewald) is properly deleted already by Griesbach, after A, B, C, min. The particle does not generally occur in the Apoc., for xxi. 12 undoubtedly is found improperly in the *Rec.*; and even though xix. 18 after *ἐλευθ.* has good evidence (ℵ), yet it is absent in A, and is not found in the parallel xiii. 16. At the close of the verse it is added: *καὶ [ὅσα ἠκουσε] καὶ ἅτινα εἰσι καὶ ἃ χρὴ γενέσθαι μετὰ ταῦτα* (min. edd., b. Mill, Wetst.; cf. ver. 19. — Ver. 3. *ὁ ἀναγινώσκων κ. οἱ ἀκούοντες.* Thus the preponderating evidence. The singular and plural also are found in both words. — Modification of the correct *lectio media* (Beng.). — The additions of *τούτους* to *λόγους* (C), and of *ταύτης* (min., Vulg.$_2$, Syr., Ar., Primas), should be here noted. — The reading *τὸν λόγον τ. πρ.* in B, ℵ, Tisch. IX., also deserves consideration. — Ver. 4.[1] The *τοῦ* before *ὁ ὤν, κ.τ.λ.* (Elz.), in opposition to A, C, ℵ, min., is, like the *θεοῦ* (B, min.), an attempted interpretation. In the same way, the *ὃς* (Erasm. 1) before *ἦν*, instead of the correct *ὁ.* — Instead of *πνευμ. ἃ ἐστιν* (Elz.), not *πνεμ. τῶν* (Lach., sm. ed. according to A; so also ℵ), but *πνευμ. ἃ* (B, C, al., Matthäi, Lach., Tisch., Lücke). The variations seem to originate with Andreas and Arethas. — Ver. 5. The *ἐκ* (Elz.) is, according to A, B, C, ℵ, min., Vulg., etc., to be deleted (Griesb., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.], etc.; cf. Col. i. 18). — Instead of *ἀγαπήσαντι* (Elz.), according to A, C, ℵ, min., with Beng., Griesb., Lach., Tisch., read *ἀγαπῶντι.* The reading *λούσαντι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμων* is uncertain. Even Lach. and Tisch. have vacillated in their edd. For *λούσαντι* (Beng., Matth., Ew., Treg., De Wette, Tisch.) are B and Vulg.; but for *λύσαντι* (Mill, Lach., Tisch. IX. [W. and H.]) are A, C, ℵ, 6, 7, 28, Primas. The *ἐκ* which suits better *λύσαντι* is well supported by A, C, ℵ, 12. No decision is afforded by the remark of Andreas: *τῷ δι' ἀγάπης τῶν δέσμων τοῦ θάνατου λύσαντι ἡμᾶς καὶ τῶν τῆς ἁμαρτίας κηλίδων λούσαντι.* Arethas says expressly, in repeating both conceptions:

[1] In reference to vv. 4–10 of the critical text of Lachmann and Tischendorf, cf. Lücke, *Einl.*, p. 488 sqq. For criticism of text, cf. especially F. Delitzsch, *Handschriftliche Funde*, Heft I. *Die erasmischen Entstellungen*, etc., Leipzig, 1861, ii. 1862.

διττογραφεῖται τοῦτο πρὸς διάφορον ἔννοιαν. So also, in ii. 2, he trifles with a dittography of κόπος and σκόπος, of which the latter has no value in a critical respect. Ewald unjustly suspects λύσαντι as the easier reading. Perhaps λούσαντι has entered the text, because probably with a reference to vii. 14 written on the margin. Andr. and Areth. place λύσαντι first, so that the λούσαντι may appear as an interpretation. The idea following, in the context (ver. 6), suits better λύσαντι. — The ἡμῶν after ἁμαρτ. is omitted in A, 12, 16, but stands in C, ℵ, Lach. large ed., Tisch. — Ver. 6. Undoubtedly in the rec. reading, ἐποίησ. ἡμᾶς βασιλεῖς καὶ, κ.τ.λ., the βασιλείς is incorrect, against A, C, ℵ, 2, 4, 6, etc., which offer βασιλείαν, and that, too, without the succeeding καὶ; cf. v. 10. The more difficult reading, ἡμᾶς with βασιλείαν (Tisch., Ew. 2) is well attested by B, ℵ (cf., on the other hand, Lücke, p. 471), and deserves, perhaps, the preference to ἡμῖν (A, Syr., Ar., Lach. small ed.) and ἡμῶν (C, Lach.), because both forms could serve as an interpretation. At any rate, the testimony of Cod. C, here confirmed by the Vulg., is more important than that of A; cf. Beng., *Fund. cris. Apoc.*, sec. viii. — Ver. 7. For μετὰ (A, ℵ, Vulg. edd.), C has ἐπὶ from Matt. xxiv. 30, etc. — Ver. 8. The discredited addition ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος is an interpretation. — Instead of ὁ κύριος (Elz.), the reading according to all the testimonies is κύριος ὁ θεός (Beng., Griesb., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]). — Ver. 9. After ὑπομονῇ, do not read Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (Elz.), but ἐν Ἰησοῦ (C, ℵ, Vulg., Copt., Orig., Treg., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]). Cod. A has ἐν Χριστῷ; several minusc. (according to Wetst.), ἐν Χριστῷ Ιησ. (Tisch., 1854). — Ver. 11. The addition after λεγούσης, Ἐγώ εἰμι τὸ Α καὶ τὸ Ω, ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἔσχατος καὶ (Elz.), is without attestation. — Ver. 13. Instead of μαστοῖς (B, ℵ, C, Elz., Tisch. [W. and H.]), it is more proper[1] to write μαζοῖς (A, 10, 17, 18, And., Areth., Lach.). Possibly, however, the author of the Ap. wrote μαστ. contrary to the general usage. — χρυσᾶν; so Lach., Tisch., ver. 12, according to A, C, ℵ. Tisch., in 1854, had received the form χρυσῆν (Elz.). — Ver. 15. πεπυρωμένῃ. To this reading, the meaningless clerical error in A, C, points; viz., πεπυρωμένης (originating from N, H, I), which form Lach. has received. The modified πεπυρωμένοι (B, Elz., Tisch.) is without sufficient attestation. πεπυρωμένῃ, perhaps πεπυρωμένῳ (Mill, *Prol.*, 371, 507; Beng., *Gnom., in loco*), is supported by the *in camino ardenti* of the Vulg. (cf. Syr.). The Mas. (ℵ, Tisch. IX.) would belong to the χαλκολ., but incorrectly; see exposition. — Ver. 20. ὃς, Elz., Tisch.: ὃν; incorrect, and opposed to A, C, ℵ, 8, and the usage of the Apoc. Bengel already, like Lach., Tisch. IX., has οὗς. ἐπὶ τῆς δ. μ. Elz., Tisch., after C, ℵ. ἐν τῇ δ. μ. occurs (A, Lach.) because of ver. 16.

Vv. 1–3. Title and commendation of the book.[2] But it is not the words Ἀποκαλ. Ἰης. Χρ. that declare the title; but in vv. 1, 2, the prophetic character and chief contents are given,[3] and in ver. 3 follows its corresponding commendation to Christians.

Ver. 1. Ἀποκάλυψις, i.e., revelation, unveiling of things concealed as divine mysteries, which are presented to the prophetic view of John, and interpreted to him.[4] Heinrichs incorrectly: ἀποκ. = παρουσία or ἐπιφάνεια, viz.,

[1] Suidas: μαζὸς κυρίως ἐπὶ ἀνδρὸς — καταχρηστικῶς δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ γυναικὸς, μασθὸς καὶ μαστὸς κυρίως ἐπὶ γυναικός, κ.τ.λ. ["μαζὸς, properly of a man, but by catachresis also of a woman. μασθὸς and μάστος, of a woman"]. Cf. Wetstein, who has still more authorities. Luke xxiii. 29, in Cod. C, has against this usage, μαζοί.

[2] Calov., Beng.

[3] Prov. i. 1 sqq.; Jer. i. 1; Isa. i. 1.

[4] Cf. Introduction, sec. 2.

of Jesus Christ. — Ἰησοῦ Χρ. in no way an objective,[1] but a subjective genitive,[2] but not the possessive [3] or the genitive of reception; [4] but by the context Jesus Christ is designated as the author and the communicating witness.[5] ἣν ἔδωκεν αὐτ. ὁ θ. To the clause which has been concluded, since ἔδωκεν has ἣν as its object, the next clause δεῖξαι — τάχει is connected, as the infinitive δεῖξαι marks the purpose of the ἣν ἔδωκεν [6] and the words ἃ δεῖ γεν. ἐν ταχ., are combined as the object of δεῖξαι. On the contrary, Heinr.: ἣν — δεῖξαι, so that ἔδωκεν is combined with δεῖξαι in the sense of *permitted*, and then this infinitive is regarded as repeated with the object ἃ δεῖ γεν. ἐν ταχ. With the conception ἣν ἔδωκεν, cf. especially v. 7, and in general Acts i. 7; John i. 18, iii 11, xii. 49, xvii. 7 sqq.; Matt. xi. 27. In conflict with the text, and in itself incorrect, is the remark of Calov.: "It was given to Christ according to his human nature;" still more, that of C. a Lap. and Tirin: "Christ received the revelation from the Father in his conception and incarnation." [7] The revelation described in this book, Christ received from the Father, not in the flesh, but when exalted and glorified,[8] the perpetual mediator between God and man,[9] in order to communicate it by his testimony to the prophetic seer,[10] and thus besides to all his servants. Not so far as he is man, but so far as he is the Son, does the Father *give* to him.[11] [See Note XV., p. 121.] δεῖξαι. According to the constant usage of the Apoc.,[12] and the context in which the expressions ἀποκάλυψις and σημαίνειν occur,[13] to which δεῖξαι, κ.τ.λ., are correlate, this word can be understood not only in general, as Matt. xvi. 21, by "to point out, to give to know," [14] but must have also the additional reference to the prophetic vision.[15] But it does not follow hence, that by the τοῖς δούλοις αὐτοῦ, the prophets are specially meant, of whom John would here appear as the representative.[16] The particular idea shadowed in this conception of the δεῖξαι is justified, inasmuch as it is immediately explained that it is through the service of the prophet beholding Christ, that future things are proclaimed. — τ. δουλ. αὐτ., viz., not God's [17] but Jesus Christ's; as we find directly afterwards, τ. ἀγγ. αὐτου and τ. δουλ. αὐτου.[18] The parallel, xxii. 6, cannot be decisive as to the reference of the pronoun to us, as Jesus Christ is not mentioned there as the one who communicates. By the "servants of Jesus Christ," believers in general are to be understood (cf. xxii. 9, where the angel calls himself the fellow-servant not only of the prophets, but also of those τηροῦντες τ. λογ. τ. βιβλ. τουτ.). So Ebrard against Hengst. Cf. besides

[1] Heinr.

[2] As Gal. i. 12; 2 Cor. xii. 1.

[3] Ebrard.

[4] Kliefoth, who even compares it with Luke ii. 32.

[5] Ver. 5, cf. ver. 3, xix. 10.

[6] John v. 26, vi. 52; Matt. xxvii. 34. Cf. Winer, p. 298 sqq. Passages like vi. 4, vii. 2, etc., should also be compared. Instead of the construction of the inf. attached to the passive ἐδόθη, that with ἵνα, as, e.g., in ix. 5, appears.

[7] Cf., besides, Stern: "The knowledge of the future events of the Church is imparted by God the Father to the man Christ Jesus, through the Logos hypostatically united with him."

[8] Cf. v. 5 sqq.; John xvii. 5.

[9] Cf. Acts ii. 33; Eph. iv. 7 sqq.; Heb. vii. 25.

[10] Cf. xix. 10.

[11] Cf. also John v. 26.

[12] Cf. iv. 1, xvii. 1, xxi. 9, xxii. 1.

[13] Cf. also the μαρτυρ Ἰησ. Χρ., the ὅσα εἶδε, ver. 2, and besides the λογ. τ. προφητείας, ver. 3.

[14] De Wette, Ebrard.

[15] Cf. Am. vii. 1, 4; Ew.

[16] Hengstenb. Cf. Vitringa.

[17] Ebrard.

[18] Cf. ii. 20. So also Klief.

xxii. 16, according to the more correct reading. — *ἃ δεῖ γενέσθαι ἐν τάχει.* The object of *δεῖξαι*, and therefore, according to the connection with the first part of the sentence, forming the chief contents of the *ἀποκάλυψις* as written in the present book. Cf. ver. 19, where there is fuller mention made, besides the future, also of present things. — The *δεῖ*[1] depends upon the (not fatalistic) idea of "the divine ordination which could not be frustrated."[2] The idea of Divine Providence is the essential presupposition of all prophecy.[3] But when Klief. presses the *δεῖ* in such a way as though thereby the facts of prophecy belonging to the sphere of human freedom were excluded, the reason is entirely unbiblical, and inapplicable for interposing a false interpretation derived from ecclesiastical or secular history. — *ἐν τάχει* designates neither figuratively the "certainty" of the future,[4] nor the swiftness of the course of things, without reference to the proximity or remoteness of time in which they were to occur. So Ebrard, who appeals in vain to Rom. xvi. 20 and Luke xviii. 8, since not only those passages, particularly Luke xviii. 8 (where the subject is not the concrete future, but a constant rule), are dissimilar to ours, but especially because by the *ἐγγύς*,[5] ver. 3, it is decided that the *speedy* coming of what is to happen is meant. When in addition to this idea reference is made on the one hand explicitly,[6] and on the other by the very organism and contents of the book, to the patient waiting, it does not follow that we dare not understand the "*quickly*" in its strict sense,[7] but that the prophet himself distinguishes the beginning of future things, as the beginning of the ultimate completion,[8] from that distant completion itself. The evasion that the *ἐν τάχει* is to be understood "according to the divine method of computation," as in 2 Pet. iii. 8,[9] is contrary to the context.[10] — With the words *καὶ ἐσήμανεν, κ.τ.λ.*, the construction changes. As the *σημαίνειν* corresponds in meaning to the preceding *δεῖξαι*, because of which not *τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν*,[11] but *ἃ δεῖ γεν.* is to be regarded the object,[12] so not *ὁ θεός*,[13] but the one who is to show, viz., Jesus Christ, is the subject of *ἐσήμανεν*. The *δεῖξαι* occurs in the way peculiar to *σημαίνειν*, i.e., the indication of what is meant by significative figures.[14] — *ἀποστείλας* belongs to *δι' ἀγγέλου*, and that too without supplying "this prophecy,"[15] etc.: on the contrary, the *ἀποστ. διὰ* is absolute,[16] and to be understood according to the analogy of the Hebr. שָׁלַח בְּיַד.[17] Thus Ew. and Ebrard. Hengstenb., whom Klief. follows, tries to combine the *δι' ἀγγ.* with *ἐσημ.*, because in the N. T. the *ἀποστείλας* is regarded as requiring the accusative of the person.[18] But Matt. xi. 2, according to the more correct reading,[19] is *πέμψας διά*; by the parallel passage, xxii. 6, the

[1] Dan. ii. 29; Matt. xxiv. 6.
[2] Nic. de Lyra.
[3] Cf. Am. iii. 7; Acts xv. 18.
[4] Eich.
[5] Cf. ii. 5, 16, iii. 11, xxii. 7, 10, 12, 20.
[6] Cf. ver. 9, xiii. 10, xiv. 12.
[7] De Wette. A confused conception, according to which two unlike views remain unadjusted with one another.
[8] Hengstenb. Cf. C. a Lap., Tirin, Ew., Klief., etc.
[9] Vitr., Wolf, etc. (Beck). Cf. also Grot.
[10] Cf. in general *Einl.*, sec. 2.
[11] Ew., Ebrard.
[12] Hengstenb., Ew. 2, Bleek.
[13] Calov.
[14] An example, Acts xxi. 11. Cf., besides, Isa. xx. 2 sqq., viii. 1 sqq.
[15] C. a Lap., Tirin, Züll., Stern.
[16] = *hinsehend*.
[17] Ezek. iv. 13.
[18] Matt. ii. 16; Mark vi. 17; Acts vii. 14. Cf. Gen. xxxi. 4, xli. 8, etc.
[19] Lachm., Tisch. [W. and H.].

combination of ἀποστ. with δι' αγγ. is maintained, while it is also to be noticed, that, according to the analogy of all the examples cited by Hengstb., ἀποστείλας must stand *before* ἐσημ., and that thereby the inner connection with ἐσημ. is in no way obscured. — διὰ τοῦ ἀγγέλου αὐτοῦ. Grot. incorrectly: "Learn hence that even when God or Christ is said to have appeared, it ought to be understood of the angel of God or Christ, acting in his name, and representing his attributes." But God and Christ appear everywhere separated from all angels. — A difficulty lies in the fact that it is not everywhere the same angel who is the interpreter, as might be expected from our position.[1] Cf. xvii. 1, 7, xix. 9, xxi. 5, 9, xxii. 1, 6, and besides i. 10 sqq., iv. 1 sqq., vi. 8 sqq., vii. 13 sqq., x. 8 sqq. Hence Ewald thinks that the angel of ver. 1, and also mentioned in all the visions, even where not named, and where another is presented, is to be regarded as the attendant of the Apostle John. But wherefore this superfluous attendance if a third one undertakes the showing and interpreting? That the angel[2] has no more to do than to transport John into a state of ecstasy,[3] is an arbitrary conception directly contrary to ver. 10 sqq., because there John is already in the Spirit when he hears the voice of the angel. The explanation of De Wette,[4] that the angel is meant who shows John the chief subject of the entire revelation, the judgment upon Rome,[5] as all that precedes is only preparatory thereto, has against it, first, that also the important preparations are shown and interpreted to the prophet, and, secondly, that even in xvii. 1–xxii. 6, the same angel does not always appear as interpreter; for it is difficult to regard the angel *coming forth* at xxi. 9, who continues from that time to remain with the seer, identical with the one speaking already in xxi. 5.[6] Klief. refers to our position, and ascribes to the angel mentioned again in xxii. 8 the office of bringing the full revelation which is still uncertain to angels otherwise occupied. All difficulty vanishes, if, as is undoubtedly grammatical,[7] the διὰ τοῦ ἀγγέλου αὐτοῦ be *generically* conceived.[8] This appears at xxii. 6 doubly supported by the τὸν ἄγγελον αὐτοῦ in the mouth of the angel speaking at that place.[9] The ὁ ἄγγελος αὐτοῦ thus understood can apply to all the individual angels who in the different visions have the office of significative declaration.[10] [See Note XVI., p. 122.] τῷ δούλῳ αὐτοῦ Ἰωαννῃ. The seer designates himself as the servant of Jesus Christ in respect to his prophetic service.[11] The addition of his own name[12] contains, according to the old prophetic custom, an attestation of the prophecy.

Ver. 2. What Christ showed the seer, and what the latter beheld (ὅσα εἶδε), that he has testified[13] as a revelation of God through Christ (τ. λογ. τ. θ. κ. τ. μαρ. Ἰης. Χρ.; cf. ver. 1) in this book, in order that it may be read and

[1] Cf. Zech. i. 9, 13, ii. 3; Dan. viii. 16, ix. 21, where Gabriel appears as interpreter, which Züll., without ground, fancies to be our position. Cf. also Ebrard, Stern.

[2] Ver. 1, xxii. 6.

[3] Hengstb. Cf. also Ebrard.

[4] Cf. Eich., Bleek, Stern.

[5] xvii. 1, 7, 15. Cf. xix. 9, xxi. 9, xxii. 1, 6, 16.

[6] Cf. xvii. 1, 7, 15, xix. 9.

[7] Cf. Winer, p. 101.

[8] Cf. Matt. xiii. 44: τῷ ἀγρ., xviii. 17.

[9] Cf. also xxii. 16.

[10] Thus even Ewald now maintains (ii. 31) the theory of angels relieving one another.

[11] xxii. 9. Cf. Am. iii. 7; Isa. xlix. 5.

[12] Cf. vv. 4 and 9.

[13] In writing, ver. 3.

kept.[1] According to the connection borne by the clear correspondence of the individual parts, the entire ver. 2 belongs to no other than the present book.[2] But not a few expositors have referred the entire ver. 2 to the Gospel of John.[3] Others understand τ. λογ. τ. θ. as referring to the Gospel, and τ. μαρτ. Ἰησ. Χρ. to the Epistles of John; and, finally, the ὅσα (τε) εἶδε to the present revelation.[4] To the former, then, the εἶδε is understood in the sense of 1 John i. 1, as referring to the immediate eye-witness of the apostle who had seen the miracles, death, resurrection, and ascension of Christ. With this false view of the whole are connected particular errors; viz., that τ. μαρτ. Ἰησ. Χρ. is explained as "the testimony concerning Christ,"[5] or when the correct recognition of the subjective genitive is applied to a special testimony,[6] and τ. λογ. τ. θ. is understood[7] of the hypostatic Logos.[8] The occasion for referring ver. 2 not, or not exclusively, to the present book, lies in the aor. ἐμαρτυρ. and the false reading ὅσα τε εἶδε. So formerly by Ewald: "who professed the Christian religion, and declared the visions which he saw." He must thus regard the ἐμαρτ. repeated by a species of zeugma, in order to be able to refer the ὅσα (τε) εἶδε, according to ver. 19, to the present revelation; while he must interpret the preceding words, as he cannot properly refer to the Fourth Evangelist,[9] in an entirely general sense. But the connection between vv. 1, 2, 3, is decisive against Ebrard, while the aor. ἐμαρτυρ. is very easily explained by the fact that John pictures his readers[10] to himself.[11] Besides, that the revelation of Jesus Christ[12] belongs to the Christians who are to hear it,[13] is necessary, from the fact that John by his testimony[14] brings it to them; this occurs in the present book,[15] whose contents he therefore charges them to hear and keep. Against Ebrard and Klief, who acknowledge the correct reading, ὅσα εἶδε, testimony is given especially by the indubitable significance of the expression in ver. 19, and all other passages in which John designates his reception of the vision of the revelation by εἶδον. But if the ὅσα εἶδε belongs to the visions here described, and yet cannot designate the position of the writer as an apostolic eye-and-ear witness,[16] and if the τε is false, then these words must form a suitable apposition to τ. λογ. τ. θ. κ. τ. μαρτ. Ἰησ. Χρ. These two expressions are, however, perfectly clear already from ver. 1. The entire revelation, as here published in writing[17] in various λόγοι τ. προφ.,[18] is a λόγος τ. θεοῦ, because it was originally given by God;[19] it is further a μαρτυρία Ἰησ. Χρ., since Christ, the faithful witness,[20] "shows" it.[21] Discrepant with this is Ewald, ii.: "The

[1] Ver. 3.

[2] So Andr., Areth., C. a Lap., Beza, Beng., Züll., Bleek (*Beitr.*, p. 192), Hofmann (*Weiss. u. Erf.*, ii. 308), De Wette, Lücke (*Einl.*, p. 510 sqq.), Stern, Ewald, ii.

[3] Ambrosiast., Beda, Nic. de Lyra, Aretius, Grot., Wolf., Eichh., Ebrard (who at the same time refers to "the apostolic activity" of John "in other respects"), Klief.

[4] Coccej., Vitr. Cf., besides, Hengstb.

[5] N. de Lyra.

[6] John xviii. 37. Oeder in Wolf.

[7] Ribera, Ebrard.

[8] Cf. xix. 13.

[9] "Who did not blush to publicly confess and defend the Christian religion."

[10] Cf. ver. 3.

[11] "Because, when the book was read in Asia, he already had written it" (Beng.).

[12] Ver. 1.

[13] Ver. 3.

[14] Ver. 2. Cf. ver. 11.

[15] Ver. 3.

[16] Acts i. 21 sqq. Klief.

[17] Cf. xxi. 5, xxii. 10.

[18] Ver. 3, xxii. 18.

[19] Cf. xxii. 6.

[20] Ver. 5. Cf. xxii. 20.

[21] Ver. 1.

testimony of Jesus Christ *to* the truth of this word." The ἐμαρτύρησε, according to its meaning, finally can be said as well of the Prophet John[1] as of the angel,[2] who in like manner interprets to the gazing prophet the revelation made in the visions, as the latter interprets it to Christians.[3] Even to Christ, as the communicator of the revelation, is the μαρτυρεῖν to be ascribed.

Ver. 3. Commendation of the book, which, to those who receive and keep it, may be a source of blessedness in the near impending and decisive time. — Μακάριος refers alone[4] to the participation in the kingdom of glory, which follows the conflict and tribulation of the preceding judgments, but not at the same time,[5] that the godly are to be preserved amid these judgments. — ὁ ἀναγινώσκων καὶ οἱ ἀκούοντες, κ.τ.λ. These are not, in spite of the change of singular and plural, to be regarded the same subject;[6] but by the ὁ ἀναγιν. the public reader, and by the οἱ ἀκούοντες the hearing congregations, are designated.[7] This exposition is not "more tasteless," but is far more natural, than that according to which ἀκούειν[8] means, not simply "to hear," but "to lend the ear of understanding." — τ. λογ. τ. προφ. By this John names this book,[9] because what he is to publish in the same in writing (τὰ γεγρ. ἐν αὐτῇ) is a divine revelation, of which he as a prophet is the interpreter.[10] — By the mere hearing, of course, nothing is accomplished: hence John adds to what is said elsewhere only in xxii. 7: Καὶ τηροῦντες, κ.τ.λ. The τηρεῖν is properly explained in conformity with its meaning by supplying mentally, "in their hearts;"[11] only, still further, that so far as what is written in the book contains, directly or indirectly, the commandments of fidelity, patience, etc., the additional relation which prevails in the combination τηρ. τὰς ἐντολάς[12] results.[13] — ὁ γὰρ καιρὸς ἐγγύς. Foundation for the commendation of the book which has just been expressed: the time[14] which will bring blessedness to the faithful is at hand;[15] blessed, therefore, he who takes to heart the instruction here offered.[16] Notice here how in xi. 18, xxii. 10, cf. xii. 12, 14, the expression ὁ καιρός is used, i.e., the fixed, expected point of time; while ὁ χρόνος, on the other hand, is time in general, according to the conception of duration, and is otherwise more external and chronological.[17]

Vv. 4–8 contain the epistolary dedication of the entire book to the seven congregations of Asia,[18] vv. 4–6, and its fundamental thought, vv. 7, 8. Thus the reference of vv. 4–8 to the *whole* of the book has been correctly expressed in essentials by Beng.[19] So, also, Klief, who, however, separates vv. 7, 8, from vv. 4–6, and tries to refer vv. 7–20*a* to the fundamental vision. The opinion

[1] Against Ebrard.
[2] xxii. 16.
[3] Cf. xix. 10.
[4] According to xix. 9, xx. 6, xxii. 14. Cf. with ii. 7, 11, 17, 26, iii. 5, 12, 21 (xiv. 15).
[5] Hengstb., Ebrard.
[6] Wolf, Ebrard. The comparison of ver. 7, πᾶς ὀφθ. and καὶ οἵτινες, is inapplicable, since in the very conception πᾶς a plurality is presupposed.
[7] Beng., Ew., De Wette, Hengstb., Bleek, Stern [Beck].
[8] Cf. xxii. 18.
[9] *Idem.*
[10] Cf. Introduction, sec. 2.
[11] Pricäus, Grot., Ewald, De Wette, etc.
[12] Cf. xiv. 12.
[13] Cf. in general my commentary on 1 John ii. 3.
[14] xi. 18.
[15] Cf. ver. 1, ἐν τάχει.
[16] Cf. 1 Pet. iv. 7, 17; Rom. xiii. 11.
[17] vi. 11, x. 6, xx. 3. Cf. Lünemann on 1 Thess. v. 1.
[18] Mentioned in ver. 11.
[19] Cf. Herder, Ew., Lücke, De Wette, Rinck, Ebrard.

of Hengstenberg,[1] that vv. 4–6 have reference only "to the group of the seven epistles," since everywhere, from i. 4 to iii. 22, the treatment is concerning the wide province of the entire Church, and there is no special reference to the seven churches, is incorrect, for the reasons that not the contents of the seven epistles, but only those of the entire book, satisfy the announcement of vv. 7 and 19; and that, in a formal respect, the correspondence between the introduction, i. 1 sqq., and the conclusion, xxii. 6 sqq.,[2] makes manifest as a whole all that intervenes.

The epistolary introductory greeting, vv. 4, 5, is similar to the Pauline form,[3] but, in its contents, corresponds to the book which follows, with significative references to which it is filled. — John[4] writes to the seven churches in Asia. Ἀσία[5] is Proconsular Asia, consisting of the provinces of Phrygia, Mysia, Caria, Lydia, Ionia, and Æolis. Ephesus[6] was regarded the metropolis. In this Asia, Paul had planted the gospel; also, the First Epistle of Peter had its first readers there.[7] — In the greeting, χάρις and εἰρήνη are combined, as in all the Pauline Epistles except 1 and 2 Timothy, where, as in 2 John 3, ἔλεος is inserted. χάρις always stands in the foreground as the fundamental condition whence all salvation, all Christian χαίρειν, alone proceeds; the εἰρήνη, the effect of divine grace, has an important significance at the head of the book which treats in an especial way of the conflicts of believers. Falsely, N. de Lyra: "*grace* in the present life; *peace* in the future, for there human appetite will be altogether quieted." Rather is the peace which believers already have, through grace, of such nature that they maintain it through patience and victorious perseverance in in all tribulations.[8] — ἀπὸ ὁ ὤν, κ.τ.λ. Description of the divine name יהוה,[9] but not under the cabalistic presupposition, that in that name itself, in a mystical way, the three tenses are indicated.[10] As to the form of the expression, neither is the manifestly intentional combination of the nom. ὁ ὢν, κ.τ.λ., with ἀπό to be impaired by the insertion of τοῦ,[11] or by supplying τοῦ λεγομένου ὁ ὤν, κ.τ.λ., τοῦ ὅς ὁ ὤν, κ.τ.λ., τοῦ θεοῦ ὅς ὁ ὤν, κ.τ.λ., etc.;[12] nor is the irregularity, that, in the absence of a necessary preterite participle in the formula ὁ ἦν, the finite tense is treated as a participle, to be accounted for by the false conception that ὁ stood for ὅς;[13] nor, finally, is ὁ ἐρχόμενος to be taken as precisely equivalent to ὁ ἐσόμενος[14] by an accommodation of the use of הַבָּא, perhaps with an allusion to Mark x. 30, John iv. 21, v. 25, xvi. 25, 31: but,

[1] Cf., against him, Lücke, p. 420, Ebrard, and Rinck.

[2] Cf. especially xxii. 16 with i. 4.

[3] Rom. i. 1 sqq.; 1 Cor. i. 1 sqq. Cf. Ew., De Wette, Hengstb.

[4] Cf. ver. 2.

[5] ἡ ἰδίως καλουμένη Ἀσία (Asia properly so called), Ptolem., v. 2. Cf. Winer, *Realiex., in loc.*

[6] Cf. ver. 11.

[7] 1 Pet. i. 1. Cf. Introduction, sec. 3.

[8] Cf. ver. 9, iii. 10 sqq.; Rom. v. 1 sqq.; John xvi. 33.

[9] Cf. Exod. iii. 14. LXX.: ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὤν.

[10] Cf. yet Bengel: "Incomparable and wonderful is the composition of the name יהוה from יִהְיֶה, *he shall be*, and הֹוֶה, *being*, and הָיָה, *he was*." Cf. Jerusalem Targum on Exod. iii. 14: "Who was, is, and will be, spake to the world." [Etheridge's translation, i. p. 450: "He who spake to the world, Be, and it was; and who will speak to it, Be, and it will be."] *Targ. Jon.* on Deut. xxxii. 39. Wetst.

[11] Erasmus.

[12] Cf. Wolf.

[13] Schöttgen.

[14] Ewald, De Wette, Ebrard.

in that inflexible firmness of the divine name,[1] there is something mysterious;[2] viz., an intimation of the immutability of the eternal God [see Note XVII., p. 122], who, as is shown also by the idea itself of eternity, and especially by the ὁ ἐρχόμενος,[3] rules the destinies of his people, as well as of the hostile world, brings his prophecy to fulfilment, and especially holds in his firm hand the entire development of the judgment. Accordingly, John writes not ὁ ἐσόμενος, but with living reference to the fundamental thoughts of the book,[4] ὁ ἐρχόμενος, as also ver. 8, iv. 8. [See Note XVIII., p. 122.] The question whether, by the formula ὁ ὢν κ. ὁ ἦν κ. ὁ ἐρχόμενος, the triune God, or only God the Father, be designated, can be answered only in connection with the two following members of the sentence. The ἑπτὰ πνεύματα, κ.τ.λ., are, at all events, to be regarded not as angels, neither[5] as "the entire body of angels" (*universitas angelorum*), who are the ministers of our salvation,[6] nor[7] as the seven archangels[8] found again in viii. 2;[9] against this, the expression,[10] its occurrence before Ἰησοῦ Χρ., and the circumstance that from the ἑπτὰ πνεύματα, as well as from ὁ ὢν, κ.τ.λ., and from Ἰησ. Χρ., grace and peace are to proceed.[11] The seven spirits are, according to iv. 5, where they appear "before the throne of God," "spirits of *God*" himself; according to ver. 6, they are "the sent upon the whole earth," and peculiar to the Lamb, as the seven eyes thereof. Christ "*hath*" the seven spirits.[12] Thus they belong to God and Christ himself in a way other than can be conceived of any creature. But they cannot be regarded mere attributes or manifestations, "the (seven[13]) virtues of God's providence,"[14] "the seven members, as it were, of Divine Providence,"[15] "the most perfect nature of Jehovah,"[16] "the virtues, or what is proclaimed, of the Supreme Divinity,"[17] — which is neither clear in itself, nor consistent with John's concrete mode of view; nor can the cabalistic personifications of the divine glory, nor the *ten* Sephiroth, be here thought of.[18] Essentially, by the seven spirits before the throne of God, nothing else can be understood than "the Spirit" who speaks to the churches,[19] and the Spirit of Christ[20] who makes men prophets.[21] Nevertheless, the sevenfoldness of this one Spirit is not to be explained, and, least of all, by an appeal to

1 ἀπὸ ὁ ὤν, κ.τ.λ. Cf. ver. 5.

2 Valla. Cf. L. Cappell., Pric., Grot., C. a Lap., Beng., Stern, Hengstenb., Winer, p. 66, etc.

3 See below.

4 Cf. Introduction, sec. 2.

5 With N. de Lyra.

6 Cf. on ver. 4: "By the number *seven*, the whole class is understood."

7 With Areth., Ribera, Viegas, C. a Lap., Bossuet, Drusius, J. Mede, etc. In the year 1460, their names (Michael, Gabriel, Raphael, Uriel, Sealthiel, Jehudiel, and Barachiel) were said to have been revealed to a certain Amadeus, a man eminent for holiness, miracles, and prophecies. Cf. C. a Lap., Tir.

8 Cf. Tob. xii. 15.

9 Ew. ii.

10 Cf. viii. 2, ἄγγελοι.

11 Cf. already Vitr., etc.

12 iii. 1.

13 Alcasar enumerates the seven virtues of God, or endowments of Providence, thus: "Wisdom, fortitude, beneficence, justice, patience, threatening, severity." This exposition C. a Lap. tries to combine with that received by most of the ancient Catholic interpreters, by stating that it is by means of angels that these virtues are exercised.

14 Pareus.

15 Grot.

16 Eichh.

17 Heinrichs.

18 Herder.

19 ii. 7, 11, 29.

20 iii. 1, v. 6; cf. xix. 10.

21 Cf. also xiv. 13, xxii. 17.

Isa. xi. 2, of the assumed "seven energies" of the Spirit;[1] but[2] John's type is Zech. iii. 9, iv. 6, 10. The Spirit cannot be beheld in his essential unity as he is before God's throne, or as sent forth into all lands; besides, there is need of a concrete presentation,[3] which occurs according to the holy number of seven, representing the divine perfection; thus the one Spirit, who, as in Zechariah, is the treasure of the Church,[4] appears as seven eyes, lamps, or even as seven spirits.

This view of "the seven spirits before the throne of God" gives the answer to the question whether ὁ ὢν κ. ὁ ἦν κ. ὁ ἐρχ. be God the Father,[5] or the triune God[6] The question itself is properly more of a dogmatical than of an exegetical character, because nothing is more distant from John than the dogmatic reflection whence that question originates. Yet the answer must be given, on the one hand, that the expression ὁ ὤν, κ.τ.λ., as a description of the name יהוה, designates the God who in ver. 1 is called ὁ θεός,[7] and in like manner is represented to be distinct from Christ, as vv. 4, 5, treat of the seven spirits and of Christ; and, on the other, that the threeness of "him who is," etc., of the seven spirits, and of Jesus Christ, not only has "an analogy with the Trinity,"[8] but actually includes, in itself and in the doctrinal connection of the entire book,[9] the fundamental idea of the Trinity, which, if developed and dogmatically expressed, yields the result that the designation of the divine nature (ὁ ὤν, κ.τ.λ.) is confined to the representation of the Father. [See Note XIX., p. 122.]

Ver. 5. As from the seven spirits of God, as the Spirit of God and of the Lamb beheld in living concretion, comforting, warning, strengthening believers, but judging the world, grace and peace are wished; so also, finally (vv. 5, 6), from Jesus Christ, since he is ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστὸς, κ.τ.λ. The construction with the genitive is not abandoned in order to indicate "the immutability of the testimony,"[10] neither is it aided by supplying ὃς ἐστίν:[11] but the importance of the ideas breaks through the limitations of regular form; the abrupt mode of speech makes prominent the intense independence of all three predicates. Compare the energetic change of construction in the sentences immediately following. All three predicates of Jesus Christ stand in pragmatic connection with the contents of the entire ἀποκάλυψις communicated through him, but not[12] in correspondence with the three themes of the ascription of praise, τ. ἀγαπῶντι, λύσαντι, and ἐποίησεν ἡμ. βασιλ., κ.τ λ. Inconsistent with the conception and reference of the three predicates, is also the opinion that in them Christ "is characterized according to the consecutive series of his works, and therefore according to his threefold office."[13]— Christ exalted to his majesty is first ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστός, i.e., the trustworthy[14] witness, and not because in his earthly life he testified, in general,

[1] Andreas; cf. Victorin., Primas., Beda, Revius, Zeger, Wolf, etc.
[2] Cf. Ew., De Wette, Hengstenb., Ebr.
[3] Cf. Matt. iii. 16; Acts ii. 2 sqq.
[4] Hengstenb.; cf. with Zech. iv. 6, also John xvi. 8.
[5] Alcasar, Calov., Hengstenb., Ebrard.
[6] Ribera, C. a Lap.
[7] Cf. especially ver. 8.
[8] De Wette.
[9] Cf. iii. 1, v. 6, 12 sqq.
[10] Grot., Stern.
[11] Er. Schmid, Schöttg.
[12] According to Ebrard.
[13] Ebrard. Cf. also Coccej., Vitr., Calov.
[14] Because true. Cf. iii. 14, xix. 11, xxi. 5, xxii. 6.

to the divine truth,[1] and maintained it even unto death; [2] nor because what he has threatened and promised in the flesh [3] he will execute: but also, not alone because of the attestation to apocalyptic truth,[4] which reference, of course, must not be omitted, but absolutely as the very one through whom each and every divine revelation occurs, who communicates predictions not only to the prophets in general,[5] as at present to the writer of the Apoc.,[6] but also testifies to the truth [7] by reproving, admonishing, and comforting the churches. That, just on this account, Christ was the faithful witness in the flesh, is self-evident, but lies here beyond the sphere of the visions. — *ὁ πρωτότοκος τῶν νεκρῶν*. This figurative expression [8] agrees, as to its essential meaning, with the figure, *ἀπαρχη τῶν κεκοιμημένων*, 1 Cor. xv. 20.[9] The figure is obliterated if *πρωτότοκος*,[10] without any thing further, be received like *ἀρχή*, the first.[11] Grot. already justly remarks, "The resurrection is a birth." [12] Yet the view according to which the resurrection to a new life [13] appears as a birth is to be maintained in its simplicity, and not, as with Ebrard, to be further portrayed.[14] But, since Christ is the *πρωτότ. τ. νεκρ.*, he may represent himself as in ver. 18, ii. 8; and that applies to him as returning, which ver. 7 represents as the fundamental thought of the book. [See Note XX., p. 123.] *καὶ ὁ ἄρχων τῶν βασιλέων τῆς γῆς*. This, Christ — to whom, as the Messiah, and that too as one dead and risen again, the dominion over all things belongs [15] — will prove himself to be, in the judgment, at his advent.[16]

If the three predicates of Christ just mentioned are presented without formal opposition, because in this way the unconditional objectivity of the ideas is the more forcibly marked, the subjective references in the following expressions, *τ. ἀγαπ. ἡμᾶς, λυσ. ἡμας εκ τ. ἁμαρτ. ἡμῶν, ἐποιησ. ἡμῶν βασιλ.*, require that they be made in the form of a doxology. The new clause, *τῷ ἀγαπῶντι ἡμ.*, looks from the very beginning to the close (*αὐτῷ*) *ἡ δόξα, κ.τ.λ.*; the *αὐτῷ* restoring the original form of the sentence after it had been interrupted, after a Hebraistic manner, by the finite tense, *καὶ ἐποίησεν*.[17] — The present, *τ. ἀγαπῶντι*, is neither to be accounted for by the false reading *ἀγαπήσαντι*, nor to be explained in the sense of an imperfect participle; but, on the contrary, the certainty that Christ continues to love his people is just as significant

[1] Cf. John iii. 11; 1 Tim. vi. 13; Andr., Areth., Par., Coccej., Vitr., Grot., Calov., Eichh., Züll.

[2] Ebrard.

[3] Ewald compares John vii. 7; Hengstenb., in addition to John iii. 11; also John xvi. 33, etc.

[4] Ver. 2, De Wette; cf. Heinr., Ew. ii.

[5] xix. 10.

[6] Ver. 2, xxii. 20, 16.

[7] iii. 14.

[8] Cf. Col. i. 18, *πρωτότοκος ἐκ τ. νεκρ.*

[9] Where also the partitive genitive denotes the mass to which Christ belongs.

[10] Cf. also Col. i. 15, where Christ as the *first-born* is distinguished from that *created* by him.

[11] Hengstenb.

[12] Cf. also Ew.

[13] Cf. the *ἔζησεν*, ii. 8.

[14] That the expression *ὠδῖνες*, Acts ii. 24, properly has not been derived by Luke from the LXX. of Ps. xviii. 5 (cf. ver. 6), but that Peter actually spake of the "bands" of death, is inferred from the fact that it is said that Christ could not have been held by it, viz., by death. That "the birth-pangs of death" could not have held Christ, that Christ forced his way through "these birth-pangs of death," and therefore is to be understood as the first who "opened the womb," is the inference of Ebrard.

[15] Ps. ii.; cf. Acts xiii. 33; Ps. cx., lxxii. 10 sqq., lxxxix. 28; Isa. lii. 13 sqq.; Phil. ii. 9; Matt. xxviii. 18.

[16] Cf. vi. 15, xvii. 14, xix. 16.

[17] De Wette, etc.

in the connection of the book as that of his being the faithful witness.[1] The bride is comforted, and rejoices in the coming of Him whom she loves.[2] — *καὶ λύσαντι ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῶν ἁμαρτ. ἡμ., κ.τ.λ.* The loosing which Christ has accomplished[3] by means of his blood[4] [see Note XXI., p. 124] represents our sins as a power enchaining us.[5] For the thought, cf. the similar conception of *ἀγοράζειν*, v. 9.[6] The reading *λούσαντι*[7] yields, according to another figure,[8] essentially the same idea, in both of which[9] the forgiveness of sins and liberation from their power[10] are comprised. Yet, even in an exegetical respect, the reading *λύσαντι* is preferable. As in v. 9 the allied idea of the *ἀγοράζειν*, so also here the *λύσαντι ἡμ.* is followed by the declaration which, in most forcible opposition to the bondage of the sins from which we are delivered, ascribes to us a royal dominion and holy priesthood with God.

Ver. 6. In the reading *ἡμῶν βασιλείαν*, as well as the variation *ἡμῖν*, the *βασιλεία* designated is undoubtedly the royal sovereignty of believers,[11] to whom, therefore, v. 10, a *βασιλεύειν* is directly ascribed.[12] Were the reading *ἡμᾶς βασιλείαν*, which is certainly that of v. 10, to be received here, upon grammatical considerations, the words could not signify that the redeemed are a "kingdom" in the sense of "a people of kings," as *ἱεράτευμα*[13] is "a people of priests,"[14] or "a royal power opposed to the world."[15] (If this idea is to be reached, we must read either *ἡμῖν*, or,[16] in conflict with all the testimonies, with the Rec., *ἡμᾶς βασιλεῖς*); but only that the redeemed are the "kingdom" of God, the subjects, and, of course, also the blessed sharers in God's kingdom.[17] — *ἱερεῖς τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ.* These words stand in apposition to *ἡμῶν βασιλείαν*. The formal inconsequence that the *ἱερεῖς* is in apposition with a *ἡμᾶς* supplied from the *ἡμῶν βασιλείαν*,[18] each of the two points shows with especial force and independence. — The *αὐτοῦ* belongs not only to the *πατρί*,[19] but to the entire conception *τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρί*, as also Rom. xv. 6.[20] In the first case, the article must be repeated before the *πατρί*. But, on the other hand, John could not write as Ebrard, according to the analogy of vi. 11, ix. 21, John ii. 12, expects, *τῷ θεῷ αὐτοῦ καὶ τ. πατρὶ αὐτ.*, because thus two different subjects would be presented; viz., first, the God of Jesus Christ, and, secondly, the Father of Jesus Christ.[21] — "Priests unto God"[22] are the redeemed of Christ, and invested with the kingdom, in no way for the reason that they help to complete the sufferings of Christ;[22] for, while the suffering of believers must be considered the suffering of witnesses or

[1] Cf. iii. 19.

[2] xxii. 17; cf. also Rom. viii. 37 sqq.

[3] In regard to the meaning of the aor. *λύσαντι* and *ἐποίησεν*, cf. v. 10; Heb. vii. 27; Gal. ii. 20.

[4] Cf., concerning this meaning of the *ἐν*, vi. 8; Winer, p. 363.

[5] xx. 7, where also the *ἐκ*, ix. 14, 15, xx. 3; cf. Matt. xvi. 19, xviii. 18.

[6] 1 Cor. vi. 20; Gal. iii. 13; Acts xx. 28; 1 Pet. i. 18; Eph. i. 7; Matt. xx. 18.

[7] Cf. Critical Notes.

[8] Ps. ii. 4; Isa. i. 16, 18; Rev. vii. 14.

[9] Cf., on the other hand, De Wette.

[10] Cf. the *καθαρίζειν* of 1 John i. 7.

[11] Ver. 9, xvii. 12, 17, 18; Luke i. 33, xix. 15; cf. also Dan. vii. 22, 27.

[12] See *Exposition, in loco.*

[13] Exod xix. 16; 1 Pet. ii. 9.

[14] Hengstenb.

[15] Klief.

[16] Keil on Exod. xix. 6.

[17] De Wette, Ebrard.

[18] Cf. v. 5.

[19] De Wette, Ebrard.

[20] Cf. Gal. i. 4; 1 Thess. iii. 7; Winer, p. 121.

[21] Cf., in general, John xx. 17.

[22] Col. i. 24; Ebrard.

martyrs, just in this is the idea of the suffering of a priest, which belongs absolutely only to one High Priest,[1] surrendered. But the priesthood of all the redeemed[2] lies in this, that they come immediately to God, offer to him their prayers, and further give themselves peculiarly to him in holy obedience and spiritual service.[3] A similar idea occurs, when, in xxi. 22, the new Jerusalem appears without a temple. [See Note XXII., p. 124.] *αὐτῷ*; viz., *τῷ αγαπῶντι ἡμᾶς, κ.τ.λ.*, therefore Jesus Christ. To *ἡ δόξα, κ.τ.λ., ἐστίν* is understood.[4]

Vv. 7, 8. Just as Amos (i. 2), by a forcible expression, concentrates the chief contents of his book at the very head; so here the writer of the Apoc., who in this also follows the mode of the ancient prophets, by adding to the passage ver. 7. containing the sum of his entire prophecy,[5] the full authority of the name of God, of whose message he is the prophet, ver. 8.[6] Klief. incorrectly denies that the *parousia* is the proper theme of the Apocalyptic prophecy, and therefore combines vv. 7, 8, not with vv. 4–6, but with ver. 9 sqq.

Already the *ἰδού* is an indication that something important is presented.[7] — *ἔρχεται*. He (Christ) cometh;[8] this is the theme of the Apoc.,[9] which is expressed here not in indefinite generality, but directly afterwards its chief points, as they are further unfolded in the book, are stated. For the coming of the *personal* Christ is a coming to *judgment*,[10] and indeed not only for hostile Jews (*οἵτινες αὐτὸν ἐξεκέντησαν*), but also for the heathen (*καὶ κοψ. πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς*). Christ cometh "*with* the clouds." The *μετά*[11] designates the coming one as *accompanied* by clouds; whether we are to regard these as beneath[12] or about him,[13] is not expressed. The *ἐρχ. μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν* does not form an apposition to "arising out of the sea," and is not simply a descending from heaven,[14] for the conception, xiii. 1, is too unique to correspond to the stereotyped idea in our passage;[15] also, the *μετὰ τ. νεφ.* is too significant for "down from heaven." But, according to the O. T. mode of representation, God *coming to judgment* appears surrounded by clouds.[16] [See Note XXIII., p. 124.] When he comes, absolutely all (*πᾶς ὀφθαλμός*) will see him; not only his believers, who have remained steadfast to him, and whom he, their Judge, their Deliverer, will introduce into his glory,[17] but also — as is expressly declared by the words *οἵτινες — τῆς γῆς*, — unbelievers. Among these, the first to be especially mentioned are *καὶ οἵτινες αὐτον ἐξεκέντησαν*, i.e., the Jews. Volkmar and Hilgenf.[18] incorrectly think here chiefly of the heathen, since heathen

[1] Heb. vii. 27, x. 14.

[2] Cf. Dan. vii. 18, 27, where to the *ἁγίοις τοῦ ὑψίστου* is ascribed the *βασιλεία*.

[3] Cf. Rom. xii. 1.

[4] De Wette, Hengstenb. Cf. 1 Pet. iv. 11.

[5] Cf. Joel iv. 16.

[6] Cf., especially, Am. iv. 13.

[7] Cf. xvi. 15, where, in like manner, the same fundamental thought of the book suddenly enters with surprising force.

[8] Cf. concerning the present, Winer, p. 249.

[9] Introduction, sec. 2.

[10] Matt. xvi. 27.

[11] Dan. vii. 13; Mark xiv. 62.

[12] Matt. xxvi. 64.

[13] Cf. Ps. xcvii. 2.

[14] Ebrard.

[15] Among the later Jews, the Messiah is expressly called "the cloud-man" (Wolkenmann) עֲנָנִי or בַּר נְבְלִי; cf. Ewald.

[16] Ps. xcvii. 2, xviii. 10 sqq.; Nah. i. 3; Grot., Hengstb.; cf. Knobel, *Prophetismus d. Hebr.*, i. p. 361 sqq.

[17] Cf. xix. 1 sqq., xx. 11 sqq., xxi. 1 sqq.; Matt. xxv. 31 sqq; 1 Thess. iv. 16 sqq.

[18] Introduction, p. 12.

hands directed the plunge of the lance into the Crucified. [Note XXIV., p. 124.] But decisive against this is not only the relation to the subject, but also the expression, *κ. κοψ.* — *πᾶς αἱ φυλ. τ. γῆς.* Here, as in John xix. 37, the prophecy, Zech. xii. 10, forms the foundation, where the words אֵת אֲשֶׁר־דָּקָרוּ וְהִבִּיטוּ אֵלַי are rendered by the LXX., *καὶ ἐπιβλέψονται πρὸς μὲ, ἀνθ' ὧν κατωρχήσαντο.* According to Zechariah, the converted people are to look towards their God, whom they had wounded by their infidelity and disobedience, i.e., as the LXX. correctly explain, had despised; but in this passage the "seeing," i.e., the actual beholding of the coming Christ, is understood in the sense that then, at the commencement of the judgment, repentance is no longer possible, and only terror remains concerning sins that have then undoubtedly occurred. Against the pragmatism of this passage, Ebrard wishes here to find the meaning: "When he cometh, Israel shall be converted,[1] and the nations of the earth shall certainly lament,[2] as those who have fallen away." Bengel falls into the same error, when he remarks of the *κόψονται* in the second member, "Undoubtedly with hostile, or even, on the part of some, with *penitential*, terror." How John xix. 37 is in this respect related to this passage, is not manifest; since there only the fact of the *ἐξεκέντησαν*, i.e., the thrust of the lance, is stated. The difference between John xix. 37 and this lies in the fact that there (*εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντ.*) the special point of the thrust of the lance is emphasized; while here (*αὐτὸν ἐξεκέντ.*) the subject is the death — "the slaying"[3] — in general, as the most manifest proof of hostile unbelief. As to *ἐκκεντεῖν* in this sense, cf. Num. xxii. 29, Judg. ix. 54, 2 Macc. xii. 6. Partly because of this difference, and also partly because Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion translate the word דקר, Zech. xii. 10, by *ἐκκεντεῖν*,[4] we dare not infer the identity of the Evangelist and the writer of the Apoc. — *καὶ κόψονται ἐπ' αὐτὸν πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς.* Although this expression may comprise also the Jews, yet, according to the connection, it is to be limited to the anti-theocratic and antichristian heathen. The *κόψονται*[5] obtains, by the construction with *ἐπὶ* and the acc.,[6] a graphic clearness, such as is peculiar to the entire style of the writer of the Apoc., by representing the mourning, not according to its inner reason (*ἐπ' αὐτῷ*), but according to its external direction, — towards the coming Judge.[7] — Not only by the twofold assurance in both Greek and Hebrew,[8] at the close of ver. 7, but still more completely and solemnly by the entire ver. 8,[9] is the main sentence, ver. 7, sealed. This verse contains a significant unfolding of the old prophetic formula נְאֻם יְהוָה. For the Eternal, who is at the same time Lord of all, will execute his prophecy, ver. 7.[10] — The formula *τὸ ἄλφα καὶ τὸ ὦ*[11] is, according to its meaning,[12] correctly explained by the gloss *ἀρχὴ*

[1] Zech. xii. 10. [2] Matt. xxiv. 30.

[3] Cf. vv. 9, 12, etc.

[4] But in connection with the circumstance that the LXX. at other places translate the word דקר by *ἐκκεντεῖν*, not by *κατορχεῖσθαι*, we must not infer, with Ewald, that Zech. xii. 10 also may have been originally, with the LXX., *ἐξεκέντησαν*.

[5] Cf. Zech. xii. 10; Matt. xxiv. 30.

[6] Cf. xviii. 9.

[7] Cf. 2 Cor. ii. 3; Matt. xxvii. 42, 43. See, also, De Wette.

[8] Erasmus, De Wette.

[9] Cf. exposition of vv. 7, 8.

[10] Observe here again, as in ver. 4, the relation of the name *ὁ ἐρχόμενος*.

[11] xxi. 6.

[12] Cf. i. 17, ii. 8, xxii. 13.

καὶ τέλος.[1] — ὁ παντοκράτωρ. Cf. Am. iv. 13, where the LXX. have it for אֱלֹהֵי-צְבָאוֹת.

i. 9–iii. 22. John receives in a vision the command from Christ to write down the revelations communicated to him, and to send them to the seven churches of Asia (i. 9–20). This is to be done in such a way that to each one of these churches, in a special letter (ii. 1–iii. 22), the contents of the revelation are to be applied for encouragement, consolation, and warning.

Vv. 9–20. As the ancient prophets report their call,[2] in order to prove the divine authority of their declarations,[3] so John presents, in the beginning, the commission given him by Christ himself, in order that the entire book may be acknowledged as that which it directly professes itself to be in ver. 1.

Ver. 9. Ἐγὼ Ἰωάννης. The name as in ver. 3. [See Notes on Introduction, pp. .] The combination of the ἐγώ with the name[4] is after the manner of Daniel.[5] In the same way, the authors of 4 Ezra[6] and the Book of Enoch[7] conform to Daniel's model. The formula must not be regarded as determined by the intention of the composer to distinguish himself from the speaker in ver. 8.[8] — John not only calls himself the *brother* of the readers, in the sense justified by the communicative style of vv. 5, 6,[9] but especially emphasizes what is supposed in the relation of a brother: καὶ συγκοινωνὸς ἐν τῇ θλίψει, κ.τ.λ. The inner combination of this idea with ὁ ἀδελφὸς ὑμῶν is to be inferred from the fact of the non-repetition of the article. The ἐν[10] designates the θλῖψις, etc., as the sphere in which the fellowship[11] occurs, in distinction from the objective conception of the customary genitive. So, too, the ἐν stands in the ἐν Ἰησοῦ, belonging to all three terms, θλιψ., βασιλ., and ὑπομ., whereby the Lord and Saviour represents himself as the personal ground of the tribulation and kingdom and patience of all those to whom vv. 5 and 6 pertain. A comparison has here been incorrectly made with the dissimilar ideas of Col. i. 24, 2 Cor. i. 15.[12] Cf., on the other hand, Phil. ii. 1, παράκλησις ἐν Χριστῷ. — The θλῖψις (ἐν Ἰησοῦ) is the affliction,[13] which, "for the name of Christ,"[14] has been infallibly prepared for believers, on the part of the hating and persecuting world.[15] But, as this suffering, so also does the royal glory possessed already by believers, and yet hoped for[16] in its full manifestation, lie "in Jesus" himself. Hence, e.g., iii. 21, the promise *in the mouth* of Christ. — Finally John adds yet the ὑπομονή (ἐν Ἰησοῦ), as the item ordinarily mediating between the two preceding,[17] which, therefore, is an important subject of the prophetic exhortation.[18] There is no hendiadys, either in the first or the last of the two conceptions.[19]

[1] Cf. *Jalkut Rub.*, fol. 147: "Adam transgressed the whole law, from א to ת," in Wolf.; cf. also Wetst.

[2] Cf. Jer. i.; Isa. vi.; Ezek. i.–iii.

[3] Cf. Am. vii. 14 sqq.; Exod. iii.

[4] xxii. 8.

[5] Dan. vii. 15, viii. 1, ix. 2, x. 2, xii. 5.

[6] ii. 42. [7] xii. 3, xxiv. 7, xcii. 3, cv. 15.

[8] Ewald. [9] Cf. xix. 10.

[10] Cf. Matt. xxiii. 30; Gal. vi. 6; Acts viii. 21, xxvi. 18.

[11] Respecting the expression συγκοιν., cf. xviii. 4; Phil. i. 7; Rom. xi. 17; 1 Cor. ix. 23; also, Eph. iii. 6.

[12] De Wette, Hengstenb., etc.

[13] ii. 9, 10, vii. 14.

[14] Matt. xxiv. 9; cf. xiii. 21.

[15] John xvi. 33; Acts xiv. 22.

[16] Cf. 2 Tim. ii. 12; Rom. viii. 17; Acts xiv. 22.

[17] So that the juxtaposition of these terms is not entirely without order (De Wette).

[18] Cf. ii. 2, 3, iii. 10, xiii. 10, xiv. 12.

[19] Against Heinr.

In connection with the self-designation of the composer as *ὁ ἀδελφὸς ὑμῶν*, the *entire* expression *καὶ συγκοιν.—Ἰησ.*, whose fundamental universality is marked by the three terms *θλῖψις*, *Βασιλεία*, and *ὑπομονή*, cannot be decisive as to the words *ἐγενόμην—μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ* having definite reference to the *θλῖψις* just mentioned, and therefore being understood necessarily of the *banishment* of John, whether of the apostle[1] or another John.[2] The incorrect emphasizing and specializing of the *θλῖψις* likewise leads N. de Lyra to think of the legend according to which the apostle was cast into seething oil. As most plausible for the traditional explanation, the usage of the *διά*, vi. 9, xx. 4, is cited: but in these passages we find the determinative expressions *ἐσφραγμ.*, *πεπελεκισμ.*; and a comparison may also be made with Matt. xiii. 21, xxiv. 9; John xv. 21. But the exposition proposed by Bleek, Lücke, and De Wette, according to which the *διά* indicates that John was in Patmos because of the word of God and the testimony of Jesus,—i.e., to receive the same [see Notes on Introduction, p. 91],—is decided to be correct by: (1) The in any case near parallelism of vv. 1, 2. (2) The circumstance that *ἡ μαρτυρία Ἰησοῦ*, according to the usage of the composer of the Apoc., cannot in any way be "the testimony concerning Jesus:"[3] for what Wolf remarks on 1, 2, is entirely wrong; viz., "As often as the word *μαρτυρία* occurs in the Apoc., so often does it signify the testimony concerning Christ given by others." But the genitive with *μαρτυρία* is always subjective; so that the expression *μαρτ. Ἰησοῦ* signifies regularly[4] that given by Jesus (the faithful witness, ver. 5), and the *μαρτ. αὐτῶν* the testimony given by the *αὐτοί*,[5] in which latter case the contents of the *μαρτυρία* are synonymous. This firm rule, vi. 9[6] by no means invalidates. The testimony proceeding from Jesus, because of which John was in Patmos,[7]—according to Volkmar, only an item in the account,—is, thus, that which he was to receive[8] in the Spirit.[9] Thus, even in an exegetical way, the opinion[10] is incorrect, that John had gone to Patmos in order to preach, which even in itself would be highly improbable on account of the character of the small, sparsely inhabited island. John himself intimates that the island is insignificant, by writing *ἐν τῇ νήσῳ τῇ καλουμενῃ*.[11] Patmos, to-day called Patino or Palmosa, belongs to the Sporades. Tournefort[12] found on it only a small town; there is pointed out, besides a sarcophagus with John's remains, the grotto in which the apostle is said to have received the Apoc.[13] By the aorist form *ἐγενόμην*,[14] it is clearly implied,[15] that when John *wrote* the Revelation he was no longer on Patmos. To make the command (ver. 11) conflict with this conception,[16] is

[1] Hengstenb., Ebrard, Hilgenf.; Introduction, p. 409; Gebhardt, p. 11, etc.

[2] Ewald.

[3] Ebrard, etc.

[4] i. 2, xii. 17, xix. 10, xx. 4.

[5] xi. 7, xii. 11.

[6] See on passage.

[7] Klief., who is compelled to understand the *μαρτ. Ἰησ.* in the above sense, but in other respects rejects the corresponding opposition as "violence occasioned by critical interests," advances the idea that John was conveyed to Patmos "because, *by his testimony, he was responsible* for God's saving word, and the testimony concerning the same, given by Jesus."

[8] Cf. vv. 1, 2.

[9] Cf. immediately afterwards, ver. 10.

[10] Hartwig, *Apol. d. Offenb.*, ii. 55.

[11] Beng., Heinr., Hengstenb.

[12] In Wolf.

[13] Cf., also, Winer, *Reallex., in loco.*

[14] Cf. ver. 10.

[15] Ewald, etc.

[16] Ebrard.

only to say,[1] that, "as the revelation came to an end, the book also was finished." Regard for the readers[2] cannot explain[3] the aor. *ἐγενόμην*, because in this word there is no reference to writing.

Ver. 10. With *ἐγενόμην ἐν πνεύματι* we dare not immediately combine *ἐν τῇ κυριακῇ ἡμέρᾳ*, in the sense: "I saw in the Spirit *the day of judgment*," i.e., "I foresaw it represented."[4] In contradiction with this[5] are, the fact that the presentation of *γίνεσθαι ἐν πνεύματι* is in itself complete, the expression *ἡ κυριακὴ ἡμέρα*, and the circumstance that the contents of the book are not limited to the day of judgment. The *ἐν πνεύματι*[6] designates essentially nothing else than the *ἐν ἐκστάσει* of Acts xxii. 18, xi. 5. Yet by *πνεῦμα*,[7] the Divine Spirit, in his objectivity,[8] cannot be understood,[9] but the *πνεῦμα* must by all means be interpreted subjectively.[10] The antithesis is *γιν. ἐν ἑαυτῷ*,[11] or, according to 1 Cor. xiv. 14 sqq., *ἐν τῷ νοΐ*.[12] The *ἐν πνεύματι* is understood in one way, Rom. viii. 9, and in another also in Matt. xxii. 43; Mark xii. 36, where the subjective *πνεῦμα* is designated as sanctified or prophetically illumined by the objective Spirit of God; while in the present passage, as well as in iv. 2, and especially xxi. 10, the reference to the efficacy of the Holy Ghost is in no way removed, but by *πνεῦμα* is understood only the higher, spiritual nature of man,[13] in virtue of which he is capable of receiving a revelation, having visions, and being *ἐν ἐκστάσει*. — The *κυριακὴ ἡμέρα*[14] is the first day of the week, the Sunday, which was celebrated as the day of the Lord's resurrection.[15] On the holy day, John was especially well prepared to receive the divine revelation. [See Note XXV., p. 125.] But there is no foundation for understanding the *κυριακὴ ἡμ.* of an Easter Day,[16] or for assigning to that Sunday[17] the fulfilment of the expectation, attested by Jerome, that Christ will return on Easter Day.[18] — *ὀπίσω μου* refers not to the fact that a revelation of the *invisible* God is presented,[19] nor that John must first be prepared by hearing for the impending sight, as no one can see God without dying.[20] Against both these views, is the fact that John not only actually sees Christ,

[1] If we receive with Hengstenb. (p. 116) what is inconceivable and irreconcilable with ver. 10: *ἐγενόμην ἐν πνεύματι*.

[2] As in *ἐμαρτύρησε*, ver. 2.

[3] Hengstenb., to whom Lücke (p. 814) concedes too much.

[4] Wetst.; cf., also, V. d. Honert, *Dissert. Apocalypt*, p. 77 sqq.; Winer, p. 173; Züll.

[5] Cf., also, De Wette, Hengstenb.

[6] Cf. iv. 2, xxi. 10.

[7] Cf., especially, xxi. 10.

[8] Cf. LXX., Judg. xi. 29: *ἐγένετο ἐπὶ Ἰεφθάε πνεῦμα κυρ.* (Num. xxiv. 2).

[9] As Grotius, who compares Mark i. 23, v. 5; and Ebrard, who compares Acts iv. 8 sqq.; and also Kliefoth, — say more clearly than many other expositors who appear to be of the same opinion.

[10] Cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 2, 14, 31.

[11] Acts xii. 11.

[12] Cf., also, 2 Cor. xii. 2 sqq.

[13] Cf. Rom. viii. 16.

[14] Cf. 1 Cor. xi. 20.

[15] 1 Cor. xvi. 2; Acts xx. 7; cf. Dionys. Cor. in Euseb., *H. E.*, iv. 23: *τήν — κυριακὴν ἁγίαν ἡμέραν διάγομεν* ("We keep the holy Lord's day"). Barnabas, *Ep.*, c. 15: *ἄγομεν τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ὀγδόην εἰς εὐφροσύνην, ἐν ᾗ καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνέστη ἐκ νεκρῶν, κ.τ.λ.* ("We devote the eighth day to gladness, on which also Jesus rose from the dead"), etc.

[16] Eichh.

[17] Beng.

[18] On Matt. xxv. 24, "The apostolic tradition that, at the time of the Easter vigils, it will not be allowed to dismiss the people before midnight, expecting the coming of Christ" ("Traditionem apostolicum — ut in die vigiliarum paschae ante noctis dimidium populos dimittere non liceat, expectantes adventum Christi").

[19] C. a Lap.

[20] Exod. xxxiii. 20 sqq.; Isa. vi. 5; Ewald, Hengstenb.

but also experiences the complete effect thereof.[1] It is also not to be said that "here clearly the awakening to ecstatic consciousness is described," as though John at first had seen nothing, "at least, nothing remarkable," but only first heard;[2] for "the awakening to ecstatic consciousness,"[3] which is not everywhere represented, has already occurred, since John hears or sees,[4] viz., in the Spirit. It is only the unexpected, surprising utterance of the divine voice that is here stated.[5] A comparison may, at all events, be made with Ezek. iii. 12, where, however, the presentation seems to be conditioned by the development of the scene itself. — The mighty, loud[6] voice is like the sound of a trumpet. In connection with the use of the *ὡς σάλπιγγος*[7] purely as a comparison, the remark is not applicable that the assembling of congregations, and the appearances or revelations of God and Christ, are announced with the sound of a trumpet.[8] — The voice which imparts the command, ver. 11,[9] belongs not to "an angel speaking in the person of Christ,"[10] nor to the angel mentioned in ver. 1,[11] nor to God speaking in distinction from Christ, who speaks in ver. 15.[12] It has been thought that the voice proceeds from him whom John, ver. 12 sqq., sees, and therefore from Christ himself;[13] but on account of iv. 1, this cannot be admitted. It is therefore, as in iv. 1, x. 4, 8, entirely undecided as to whom this voice belongs. This also agrees very well with the *ὀπίσω μου*.

Ver. 11. *ὃ βλέπεις*. The present is neither to be changed into the future,[14] nor to be explained by the fact, that, with the hearing (ver. 10), the seeing, in the wider sense, has already begun;[15] but is without relation to time, i.e., it is not formally noted that the visions upon which the presentation depends[16] are yet to follow. There is a similar use of *ἀποστέλλω*, Matt. xxiii. 34. The book into which John, according to the command, wrote what he had seen,[17] is the *entire* Revelation before us.[18] — The *πέμψον* in no way necessitates the conception, conflicting with the double *ἐγενόμην*,[19] that the book was written on Patmos;[20] but rather the sending of the book is explained in accordance with the epistolary superscription, ver. 4 sqq., even if one of the seven cities — perhaps Ephesus — *must* be regarded the author's place of abode, from the preponderating consideration shown it above the other cities. It is, of course, in itself improbable that John wrote long after the reception of the revelation, but he rather wrote "while the *ἐν πνεύματι* still continued in effective operation:"[21] but it would have been impossible[22] for him to

[1] As in Isa. vi. 5.

[2] Ebrard.

[3] On ch. iv. (p. 215) Ebrard interprets the *ὀπίσω μου* very preposterously as "standing upon earth." Volkmar: As the external world lies extended before man's face, so what is concealed is *back* of the world's view.

[4] iv. 1.

[5] Cf., also, Stern, but who incorrectly refers to Isa. xxx. 21. See Knobel on this passage.

[6] *μεγάλη*, v. 2; cf. Matt. xxiv. 31, xxvii. 46, 50.

[7] Cf. v. 15.

[8] Num. x. 2, 10; Joel ii. 1, 15; Exod. xix. 19; Matt. xxiv. 31; 1 Thess. iv. 16; De Wette, Hengstenb., etc.

[9] *λεγούσης* is to be construed with *σαλπ.* by attraction.

[10] N. de Lyra.

[11] Ebrard; cf. on v. 1.

[12] C. a Lap.

[13] Alcas., Ew., Hengstenb.

[14] Ew., De Wette.

[15] Hengstenb.

[16] Winer, p. 249 sqq.

[17] Cf. v. 3.

[18] Against Hengstenb.; cf. on v. 4.

[19] See above.

[20] Hengstenb., Ebrard, Klief.

[21] Lücke, p. 814.

[22] Cf. Ebrard himself *vs.* Hengstenb.

write while in the condition which he designates by *ἐγεν. ἐν πνεύματι;* for an essential element of this condition is the cessation of the activity of the *νοῦς*, upon which nothing less than every thing pertaining to the literary form and character of the book throughout depends. — The seven cities named are clearly introduced according to their geographical situation. According to the adjustment of vision from the standpoint of one directing the sending of the book, — not of the one writing, — two lines moderately direct appear from Patmos, in which the cities lie. In the first line, from south to north, are Ephesus, Smyrna, and Pergamos; in the second line, which extends from north to south, — since Thyatira, which is in the neighborhood of Pergamos, naturally stands first, — lie Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia, and Laodicea. (See on ver. 20.)

Ver. 12. *καὶ ἐπέστρεψα.* John *turns*,[1] — viz., according to the connection, backwards,[2] — in order to see. This is correctly explained according to its meaning, as "the one who uttered the voice;"[3] the *βλέπειν* has its foundation in the liveliness and directness of the presentation, which immediately penetrates from the perception of the voice to the speaker himself, just as in iv. 1 *λέγων* is written, while the subject speaking is only *φωνή*. — John now sees, after turning, seven golden candlesticks, — but in no way a candlestick[4] with seven branches,[5] — and, in the midst of them, Christ himself (ver. 13). [See Note XXVI., p. 125.]

Ver. 13. The entire appearance of Christ expresses essentially what has been said of him in vv. 5, 6,[6] and is likewise as highly significant as that declaration, as to the entire contents of the book. Hence each of the seven epistles is introduced "by a sketch of his form,"[7] as the majesty of Christ here presented, who holds his people in his hand,[8] is the real foundation and support of the apocalyptic hope.[9]

Christ appears in the midst of the seven candlesticks, not walking,[10] but rather, if any thing dare be imagined, standing. He is not named, but is infallibly designated already by the *ὅμοιον υἱῷ ἀνθρώπου*.[11] The *ὅμοιον* is incorrectly urged by those who wish to infer thence that not Christ, the Son of man himself, but "an angel representing Christ,"[12] is meant. In this expression the dogmatic thought is not present, that Christ is essentially more than a mere son of man;[13] but John had to write *ὅμοιον*, which does not correspond to the simple כְּ, Dan. vii. 13 (LXX., *ὡς*),[14] as the type of the form of the Son of man was to be recognized in the divine majesty of the entire manifestation.[15] — The Lord, who makes his people priests and kings (ver. 5), appears clad in the sublime splendor of the high priest and of kings. He wears the robe of the high priest, reaching down to his feet,[16] which, accord-

[1] Acts ix. 40.
[2] Cf. Matt. xxiv. 18; Mark xiii. 16; Luke xvii. 31.
[3] N. de Lyra, Beng., etc.
[4] Cf. the interpretation, ver. 20.
[5] Grot., etc.
[6] Cf. vv. 17, 18.
[7] Herder.
[8] Cf. ver. 20.
[9] 1 Tim. i. 1; 1 Thess. i. 3.
[10] Ebrard, according to ii. 1; cf. on that passage.
[11] Dan. vii. 13; cf. x. 16, 18.
[12] N. de Lyra, Bossuet, Grot., Marek.
[13] De Wette, Hengstenb.
[14] Ebrard.
[15] Cf. xiii. 2.
[16] *ποδήρης*, sc. *χιτων*.

ing to Wis. xviii. 24,[1] was a symbol of the world; yet God himself also appears, as he is royally enthroned, in a similar long robe.[2] To this is added the entirely golden girdle.[3] The girdle of the high priest was only adorned with gold.[4] That Christ wears the girdle *πρὸς τοῖς μαζοῖς*,[5] not about the loins,[6] is in no way to be urged in the sense of Ebrard: "The twofold nature of the unglorified body, in the nobly endowed upper part of the body, and in the lower part of the body serving the purposes of reproduction, nourishment, and discharge, vanishes in that higher girding, as it is first correctly marked by the girding above the loins." For, is Dan. x. 5 to be understood of an unglorified body? Cf., besides, Josephus, *Antiqq.*, iii. 7, 2, as to why the priests bind their girdles *κατὰ στέρνον*.

Ver. 14. To the general conception *ἡ δὲ κεφαλὴ αὐτοῦ*, the part which properly pertains to the description is attached by the more accurately determining *καὶ*.[7] Thus there is a dependence on the *ἡ δὲ κεφαλὴ αὐτοῦ*, corresponding to which are the special particulars, each of which is designated with the addition of *αὐτοῦ*; viz., *οἱ ὀφθ. αὐτοῦ*, *οἱ ποδ. αὐτοῦ*, and *ἡ φων. αὐτοῦ*, while the *καὶ αἱ τριχ.* is without the *αὐτοῦ*.[8] The order of thought is not, therefore, as De Wette proposes, first concerning the whole of the head, to which also face and beard belong, and then especially to the hair of the head. — The whiteness of the hair signifies neither the freedom from sin of Christ's earthly life,[9] nor in general the holiness peculiar to him;[10] nor does it designate merely the heavenly light-nature.[11] Christ rather appears here to the Christian prophet in the same divine brilliancy in which Daniel[12] beheld not the Son of man, but the *Ancient of days*, whose eternity is designated by the whiteness of his hair. This interpretation[13] is justified not only by the type in Daniel, but also by the fact that Christ represents himself as the Eternal One, like the Father, vv. 4, 8, in his words, corresponding to his manifestation, vv. 17, 18; cf. ii. 8. The eyes, "as a flame of fire,"[14] are, as all the other features, not without significant reference to the revelation itself.[15] By ii. 18, xix. 12,[16] the idea is presented not of omniscience in general,[17] also not of punitive justice,[18] or of holiness consuming all that is

[1] Cf. Grimm on the passage.

[2] Isa. vi. 1.

[3] Not "girdle-buckle," which, according to 1 Macc. x. 89, was peculiar to kings; Hengstenb.

[4] Exod. xxviii. 8, xxxix. 5.

[5] Cf. xv. 6.

[6] Dan. x. 5.

[7] Cf., also, Bengel, Hengstenb., Ebrard.

[8] In Dan. vii. 9, according to the LXX., there stands, on the other hand, *καὶ ἡ θριξ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ*.

[9] Areth., Coccej., Vieg.

[10] Hengstenb., who, however, understands at the same time, "the majesty of glory."

[11] De Wette.

[12] vii. 9.

[13] Cf., also, C. a Lap., Calov., Vitr., Storr., *Diss. in Apoc., quaed. loc.; Commentatt. ed. Velthusen*, etc., iv. 439; Stern, etc.

[14] xix. 12; Dan. x. 6; cf. Virg., *Aen.*, v. 647 sqq.: "Divini signa decoris ardentesque notate oculos — qui vultus vocisque sonus" ("Note the marks of divine beauty and the glowing eyes; what is the countenance, and sound of the voice"). Hom., *Il.*, xix. 365 sqq.: *τὼ δὲ οἱ ὄσσε λαμπέσθην ὡσεί τε πυρὸς σέλας* ("The eyes shone like the brightness of fire").

[15] On the other hand, De Wette: "An exaggeration of the spirited, fiery glance of human eyes, to the penetrating, consuming gaze of such eyes as belong to celestial beings, as the Greeks also ascribe to their gods, and as the Son of God has it in an unparalleled way."

[16] Cf. Ps. xviii. 9, xcvii. 3; Deut. iv. 24, ix. 3; Heb. xii. 29.

[17] Vitr., Calov., Beng., Stern.

[18] Hengstenb.; cf. Ribera, C. a Lap.

impure[1] without regard to omniscience, but of omniscience combined with holy wrath directed against all that is unholy.

Ver. 15. To such eyes of flame,[2] belong feet *ὅμοιοι χαλκολιβάνῳ ὡς ἐν καμίνῳ πεπυρωμένῃ*, which tread down unholy enemies.[3] De Wette is wrong in finding in this feature no other meaning than that of the splendor. — The word *χαλκολίβανος*,[4] which the Vulg. renders by *orichalcum*,[5] and Luther by *Messing*, is of doubtful derivation and meaning. Ewald follows an ancient testimony[6] which says that one of the three kinds of incense is so called.[7] As the entire picture has to do with more than *color*,[8] and as the type of Dan. x. 6[9] leads to the idea of brass,[10] incense can in no way be thought of. This is also, within the comparison itself, highly unnatural. The feet appear like brass, but at the same time, as the second member,[11] *ὡς ἐν καμ. πεπυρωμένῃ*, says, "as in a furnace glowing with fire," and therefore like the feet of the angel, x. 2, which are *ὡς στύλοι πυρός*. But whether the word[12] be a hybrid term composed of *χαλκός* and לְבָן, and therefore mean glowing white;[13] or "brass from Lebanon;"[14] or be taken as an intentionally mysterious designation of the ambiguous *ἤλεκτρον*, which denotes an alloy,[15] and also amber,[16] and therefore corresponds in some degree to the former as well as to the second part of *χαλκολίβανος*,[17] — cannot be certainly decided. The intentional mysteriousness is improbable; even though the idea were possible, that — of course, only in the provincialism of Asia Minor — the word were popularly formed and used in the sense received by Züllig. Wetzel,[18] by recurring to the root *λιβ*, i.e., running, flowing, reaches the explanation of molten metal (*Erzfluss*); perfectly adapted to the meaning, but without sufficient justification in the language. — *καὶ ἡ φωνὴ αὐτ., κ.τ.λ.* Cf. Dan. x. 6; Ezek. xliii. 2, i. 24. The force of the voice is represented (cf. ver. 10), but the majesty peculiar to the peaceful murmur of the sea[19] is not to be thought of.

Ver. 16. *καὶ ἔχων, κ.τ.λ.* Not for *καὶ εἶχε, κ.τ.λ.*;[20] but the participle occurs in violation of syntax, while John with a few strong touches of his pencil[21]

[1] Ebrard.

[2] v. 14, ii. 18.

[3] Ps. lx. 14; Isa. lxiii. 6; cf. Dan. x. 6, where, also, arms which cast down are mentioned.

[4] -ον, Suidas.

[5] Cf. Cic., *De Off.*, iii. 23, 12; Horace, *Ars Poet.*, 202.

[6] In Salmas, *Ad Solin.*, p. 810; also in Wetst.

[7] *ὁ λίβανος ἔχει τρία εἴδη δένδρων, καὶ ὁ μὲν ἄρρην ὀνομάζεται χαλκολίβανος, ἡλιοειδὴς καὶ πυρρὸς ἡγουν ξανθός* ("Lebanon has three kinds of trees, and one that is strong is called *χαλκολίβανος*, like the sun, and that is to say, the reddish-yellow of fire"). Against this, is the notice in Suidas: *χαλκολίβανον, εἶδος ἠλέκτρου τιμιώτερον χρυσοῦ, ἔστι δὲ τὸ ἤλεκτρον ἀλλότυπον χρυσίον μεμιγμένον ὑελῷ καὶ λιθείᾳ* ("χαλκ. of the appearance of *ἠλέκτρον*, more valuable than gold; and *ἤλεκ.* is gold of another kind mingled with glass and stone").

[8] Against Ewald, De Wette.

[9] נְחשֶׁת קָלָל: LXX., *χαλκὸς στίλβων*. Ezek. i. 7, LXX., *ἐξαστράπτων χαλκ.* Cf. Ezek. i. 4, 27, viii. 2, חַשְׁמַל: LXX., *ἤλεκτρον*.

[10] De Wette.

[11] The particle of comparison parallel with the *ὅμοιοι* renders the reading *πεπυρωμένῳ*, which is possible in a critical respect, belonging to *χαλκολιβ.* (cf. iii. 18), inadvisable for exegetical reasons.

[12] Very arbitrarily translated by Hitzig (*Johannes Marc.*, p. 63), "Ofenerz."

[13] Grotius, Bochart, *Hieroz.*, iii. p. 900; ed. Lips., Vitr., Hengstb.

[14] Syr., Aeth., Areth., Vatabl., Ebr.

[15] Suidas, s. o.

[16] Ew. ii.

[17] Züllig.

[18] *Zeitschr. fur die gesammte lutherische Theol. u. Kirche*, Leipzig, 1869, i. p. 94.

[19] Ebrard.

[20] Eichh.

[21] De Wette.

portrays the sublime manifestation.[1] Christ appears, having seven stars[2] in his right hand.[3] The stars are neither to be changed into precious stones which shine like stars, and to be sought in a ring, or seven rings, on Christ's fingers,[4] nor is it to be said that "the stars *soar* so easily, freely, and steadily, *on* or *over* his right hand, that he might confidently place them[5] upon John's head."[6] To ask at all where these stars in ver. 17 must be regarded, is a question both paltry and unpoetic. That Christ has the stars in his right hand, shows that they are his property. This is presented for the consolation of believers,[7] but not in the sense as though the power of Christ over the churches, from which no one can deliver, should he wish to punish,[8] were portrayed. This is entirely foreign to the present passage, and even in ii. 1 sqq. is conceivable only as Christ, who graciously rules and defensively walks in the midst of the candlesticks, can cast a faithless church from its candlestick,[9] or even reject a star. — *καὶ ἐκ τοῦ στόματος — ἐκπορευομένη.* Again, a new feature of the sublime picture is stated in an asyntactical way. "Who can portray this form? And yet it has occurred, alas! a thousand times, and the form of the God-man is represented as the most miserable cripple." Thus Herder; while Eichh.,[10] just in the present feature of the description, would find an offence against the laws of painting. The sharp two-edged sword which proceeds from the mouth of the Lord is, in a way similar to the feet like brass, a plastic representation of the divine power of Christ, in complete accordance with the image of the vision according to which he "slays the godless with the rod of his mouth."[11] Of the power of the word of God, preached by Christ's ministers, striking the conscience and otherwise divinely efficacious,[12] there is nothing said here. The entire description is purely personal. The sword from the mouth[13] of Christ is directed against his enemies both within[14] and without[15] the Church.[16] What a consolation for those whom he holds in his hands! — *καὶ ἡ ὄψις αὐτοῦ* designates not the countenance,[17] as *ὄψις* is used in John xi. 44 but not in vii. 24, but[18] the appearance in general. The description is not concluded by a single feature, but so that the entire form appears as surrounded with the brilliancy of the sun. We are forbidden to take *ὄψις* in the sense of *πρόσωπον* by the comparison of x. 1, where this word, frequently found in the Apoc.,[19] is regularly

[1] Cf. xix. 12, xxi. 12; where, as here, the turning aside from the original construction is facilitated by the preceding features of the description.

[2] Cf. v. 20.

[3] Holding them, ii. 1.

[4] Eichh., Heinr.

[5] v. 17.

[6] Ebrard.

[7] Cf. John x. 28 sq.; Herder, Ebrard.

[8] Hengstenb.; also Ew. ii.

[9] ii. 5.

[10] Cf., also, De Wette.

[11] Isa. xi. 4; cf. xlix. 2; Wis. xviii. 15 sqq.; 2 Thess. ii. 8.

[12] Heb. iv. 12; Eph. vi. 17; Tichon., Primas., Arethas, Vitr., Calov., Stern; cf., also, De Wette, etc.

[13] The graphic idea lying at the foundation (cf., besides, Ps. lv. 22, lvii. 5, lix. 8, etc.) is frequently expressed in the rabbins. Pirke Elies.: "Moses removed him with the sword of his lips. — Dathan said to him, 'Do you seek to slay me with the sword which is in thy mouth?'" Wetst., Schöttg., also on 2 Thess. ii. 8.

[14] ii. 12, 16.

[15] xix. 15, 21.

[16] Ebrard.

[17] Vulg., Luth., Calov., Herd., Hengstenb., Ebrard, De Wette.

[18] Valla, Erasm., Eichh., Ew., Züll.

[19] Cf. iv. 7, ix. 7, xxii. 4, vi. 16, xii. 14, xx. 11.

used; also Dan. x. 6, where *πρόσωπον* occurs, and that, too, in the beginning of the detailed description, is throughout against Hengstenberg's opinion. In like manner, in the description, Dan. x. 6, *τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ ὡσει θαρσίς*, the entire form of the Lord is to be regarded: *ὡς ὁ ἥλιος φαίνει ἐν τῇ δυνάμει*. The additional designation,[1] of course, is not necessarily to be referred to the noonday brilliancy[2] of the sun, but is correctly paraphrased by De Wette: "when its light is at the strongest."[3] The sun shines in its strength when neither mist nor clouds intercept its rays.[4]

Ver. 17. The impression made by the appearance of the Lord[5] is that of mortal terror; for, since death is the wages of sin, no sinful man can stand alive before God.[6] Yet John is supported by Him who is not only absolutely the living, but also, since he himself has passed into death,[7] and has overcome it, has redeemed his people therefrom, as he has the keys of death and hell. — De Wette finds a contradiction in the fact that "the seer beholds all this in spirit, and so represents things as though he had stood opposite to these appearances in his bodily form, and with his ordinary human powers of conception and feeling: cf. v. 4, xvii. 6, xix. 10, xxii. 8; Dan. vii. 15." But by the *ἐν πνεύματι* (ver. 10), his being in the body is not removed. Just as the feeling of those who dream is also customarily expressed in a bodily way, e.g., by actual weeping, it may readily be thought that while John actually sees *ἐν πνεύματι* — i.e., in prophetic ecstasy — the actual appearance of the Lord, he bodily sinks down.[8] — *ὡς νεκρός* is not "like one dying,"[9] but "like one dead." The laying-on of the right hand is, like in Christ's miracles of healing,[10] an accompanying friendly sign of the aid peculiarly offered through the Word. — The Lord begins his words just as heavenly beings have ordinarily to address men: *μὴ φοβοῦ*. Cf. Luke i. 13, 30, ii. 10; Mark xvi. 6 (Matt. xvii. 7). This, as also in general ver. 17 sqq., suits the opinion of Ebrard, that the falling-down of John was not merely an effect of terror, but "an act of love." — *ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ πρῶτος, κ.τ.λ.* Incorrectly, Wetst., Grot., etc., from dogmatic prejudice: "the highest in dignity — the most despised." Three times after *εἰμι*, Eichh. mis-points "I am," — as, Matt. xiv. 27; John vi. 20, which is entirely inapplicable here; and then, *ὁ πρ. κ. ὁ ἐσχ.* = "the only one in his class," *καὶ ὁ ζῶν* = "with respect to life, among the living"! Christ is, as the Father (ver. 8), the First and the Last, i.e., he is personally the A and the Ω;[11] and in this lies that which is epexegetically[12] added, that he is absolutely the Living One,[13] who, just on that account, can also give life. This reference of the conception *ὁ ζῶν*,[14] which is in itself already necessary, since the *personal* Eternal One must have his eternity as an energetic attribute, is yet specially emphasized by ver. 18; and that, too, in such way that what is said in both halves of the verse, even though

[1] Cf. Judg. v. 31; LXX.: *ὡς ἔξοδος ἡλίου ἐν δυνάμει αὐτοῦ*.
[2] Eichh., Heinr.
[3] Against Ebrard.
[4] Hengstenb.
[5] Isa. vi. 4; Exod. xxxiii. 20; Ezek. i. 28; Dan. viii. 17 sqq., x. 7 sqq.
[6] Cf., especially, Isa. vi. 4.
[7] *ἐγεν. νεκρός*.
[8] Cf. Acts ix. 4.
[9] Eichh.
[10] Beng., Hengstenb.
[11] xxii. 13.
[12] *καί*.
[13] Cf. John i. 1 sqq., v. 26.
[14] Not equal to *ζωοποιῶν*, Grot.

not according to form, yet according to meaning, is related as foundation (*καὶ ἐγεν. — αἰώνων*) and consequence (*καὶ ἔχω, κ.τ.λ.*). For, just because Christ who suffered death,[1] after having risen,[2] henceforth does not die,[3] but is living to eternity,[4] he has the keys of death and of hell, i.e., power over them, so that he can preserve and deliver therefrom, but also can cast therein.[5] The figurative presentation of the *keys*[6] must not be regarded a personification of the *θάνατος* and the *ᾅδης*;[7] but, on the other hand also, both can be regarded only as a place, when it is said that "both designate one and the same idea."[8] Yet the *θάνατος*, after which the *ᾅδης*, vi. 8, appears, is, more accurately speaking, to be distinguished from the latter.[9] To think of *θάνατος* as a *place*, is inadmissible. The gates of death[10] are spoken of in opposition to the gates of the *daughter* of Zion;[11] here death is personified, and regarded as a possessor or lord of the gates. The place of death, which appears closed in with gates, is *ᾅδης*.[12] In this double and not completely symmetrical delineation of the idea, according to which "gates" are ascribed to personal death as well as to local hell, the *κλεῖς* must here be understood. — The intention of this entire detailed address is so far in advance of merely freeing John from his terrors of death, as John is the prophet, who himself must experience and understand the majesty of the Lord, whose coming he is to proclaim, in order that he may bring to the churches full testimony concerning the same.[13] Thus ver. 19 suitably concludes.

Ver. 19. It is impossible for the *οὖν*, without reference to vv. 17, 18, to serve only to recall the command, ver. 11.[14] Hengstenb. better combines the reference to ver. 11 with that to vv. 17, 18: "When, therefore, this fear is removed, do what I have bidden thee." But, apart from the fact that it is very doubtful whether, ver. 11, Christ himself has spoken, this reference to vv. 17, 18, which even does not correspond to the meaning of these verses, is highly unsatisfactory. Grotius seems with greater correctness to remark, "Because you see that I am so powerful." The Lord, therefore, bases upon the revelation of his own majesty (vv. 17, 18) communicated to the prophet, the command to write, i.e., to give written witness to the churches (ver. 1 sqq.); since the contents of this revelation, which is to be communicated, is essentially nothing else than the full unfolding of what has been beheld by the prophet (ver. 12 sqq.), and the majesty of Christ disclosed by the Lord himself in significant words (vv. 17, 18). For the Living One will come; who was dead (ver. 18), whom they have pierced (ver. 7), but who is alive in

[1] *ἐγεν. νεκρ.* Concerning the aor., cf. ii. 8.

[2] Cf. the *ἐζησεν*, ii. 8.

[3] Cf. Rom. vi. 9; Acts xiii. 34.

[4] *ζῶν εἰμι, κ.τ.λ.*, a strong emphasis of the conception *ζῶν*.

[5] Cf. iii. 7. This has an entirely different meaning from when Acacus, the porter of the lower world, is called *κλεισδοῦχος*. Cf. H. L. Ahrens, *Das Amt der Schlussel*, Hannover, 1864, p. 6.

[6] ix. 1, xx. 1. Cf. *Targ. Jon.* on Deut. xxviii. 12: "Four keys are in the hand of the Lord, — a key of life and of tombs, and of food and of rain." Still more, the mode given in Wetst.

[7] vi. 8; xx. 11. Zūll.

[8] De Wette.

[9] xx. 13, 14.

[10] מָוֶת, LXX. *θάνατος*.

[11] Ps. ix. 14; cf. Job xxxviii. 17.

[12] שְׁאוֹל, Isa. xxxviii. 10; cf. the צַלְמָוֶת, LXX. *ᾅδης*, Job xxxviii. 11.

[13] Cf. Exod. iii.; Isa. vi.; Acts ix.

[14] Against Aretius, who immediately remarks, "*ἔκστασις* injures the memory;" also against De Wette.

eternity, whom John beheld, and was commissioned by the Coming One himself to proclaim his advent. — This is also given by the sense of the following words, which more accurately designate the subjects to be written of: *ἃ εἶδες, κ.τ.λ.* There can be no doubt that the *εἶδες* refers to the vision above narrated. The *καὶ ἃ εἰσὶν*, moreover, after its reference to *ἃ εἶδ.*, or to *κ. ἃ μελλ., κ.τ.λ.*, is fixed, means either "and what *it* is," i.e., signifies;[1] or, "and what is," i.e., the present relations.[2] The latter is far more natural, especially as the antithesis between *ἃ εἰσὶν* and *ἃ μέλλει γεν.* is marked particularly by the retrospection of the *μετὰ ταῦτα* to the *ἃ εἰσὶν*. Yet it must not be said that the *ἃ εἶδες* in ch. i., *ἃ εἰσὶν* in chs. ii. and iii., and *ἃ μελλ., κ.τ.λ.*, are comprised; but, rather, the epistles already contain the future, and the succeeding chapters the present; yea, the entire book bears the true prophetic stamp in this, that what is future is also prophesied of the present.[3] That in ver. 20 a point of the vision, ver. 12 sqq., is actually indicated,[4] can be decided concerning the meaning of the *ἃ εἶδες* the less, as by the *ἃ εἶδες* the entire vision, ver. 12 sqq , is meant.[5]

Ver. 20. *τὸ μυστήριον τῶν ἑπτὰ ἀστέρων, κ.τ.λ.*, is to be regarded as dependent upon *γράψον*. This idea is already correctly explained by N. de Lyra: "the sacrament of the stars, i.e., the sacred secret signified by them." *Μυστήριον* and *ἀποκάλυψις* are correlate ideas; for a *μυστήριον* is all that man understands, not by himself, but only by divine publication and interpretation,[6] such as immediately follows.[7] When, now, John has seen the mystery of the seven stars which are at the Lord's right hand,[8] and is to write of the mystery of the seven golden candlesticks, this is in no way undone by the second half of ver. 20, where only the simple explanation of the mysterious symbol is given. As the words *τὸ μυστηρ. — χρυσᾶς*[9] are formally equivalent to the words *ἃ εἶδες — ταῦτα*, so, also, the mystery of the seven stars and candlesticks in substance corresponds thereto. The command to write this mystery is fulfilled by nothing else than the *entire* book: for the prophetic development of the hope of the victorious completion of the Church of Christ by his return depends upon the *mystery* of the seven stars in Christ's hand, and the seven candlesticks in whose midst Christ walks; i.e., that Christ is the protector of his Church, vanquishing all enemies. This consolatory hope, perceptible only to believers, is the chief matter in the mystery of the stars and candlesticks which the prophet beholds, and whose meaning he is to testify to the churches.[10] If now, before the mystery of the seven stars with the entire treasures of prophetic admonition, warning, and comfort, be stated in this

[1] Alcas., Aret., Eichh., Heinr., Herd., Ew., Bleek, De Wette; cf. Klief., "what they are."

[2] Areth., N. de Lyra, C. a Lap., Grot., Calov., Vitr., Beng., Wolf, Züll., Hengstenb., Ebrard, Lucke p. 401, Volkm.

[3] Cf. Introduction, sec. 2.

[4] Cf. xvii. 7 sqq., and elsewhere.

[5] Against De Wette; also against Kliefoth.

[6] Matt. xiii. 11; Mark iv. 11; Rom. xi. 25; Eph. v. 32, i. 9.

[7] Cf. xvii. 7.

[8] *ἐπί*, i.e., resting on the same, and therefore as to substance nothing else is to be understood that the *ἐν*, v. 16.

[9] In an apposition without the *καὶ*.

[10] Inconceivable, however, is the idea expressed by Klief., that, during the entire revelation (until xxii. 5), the Lord remains standing alongside of John in the situation described in the vision, i. 10-18. Already in ch. iv. the situation changes.

sense,[1] an express interpretation of the symbols beheld by John be given,[2] this is just the key to the entire mystery, — the fundamental meaning, from which the correct application of all that follows depends. The essential meaning of the two symbols is unmistakable: the candlesticks are an easily understood figure of the churches,[3] which have received their light from Christ, and continue to be sustained by the Lord, who walks in their midst.[4] An allied idea must lie, however the ἄγγελοι be understood, in the symbol of the stars in Christ's right hand, whereby, at all events, the ἄγγελοι of the churches are described, and that in such a way that to the churches themselves belongs [5] what is ascribed to their angels.[6] So far, all interpreters are unanimous. The controversy centres upon the word ἄγγελοι. This must mean either "messenger"[7] or "angel." To the former meaning, Ebrard holds, by understanding messengers of the churches to John: not "ordinary letter-carriers, but delegates of the churches, who report to him, and are again to convey his apostolic prophecies to the churches; who therefore hold a similar position between him and the churches to that which Epaphroditus probably held between Paul and the Philippians;"[8] yet these messengers are represented as existing not in reality, but "only in vision." "Beneath the stars, John is to *regard* himself the ambassador of the churches." Against the unnaturalness of such an opinion, Vitr.,[9] Wolf, Schöttgen, Beng., Eichh., Heinr.,[10] Ewald, etc., have guarded, who understand the "messenger" of the Christian churches, after the manner of the Jewish שְׁלִיחַ צִבּוּר, of an officer subordinate to the priest, who has to read, pray, and care for external matters of many kinds. But apart from the question as to whether this messenger of the synagogue existed already in apostolic times, the same can only with difficulty be regarded a type of the Christian bishop or elder; for only that officer, and not the deacon,[11] dare at any rate be regarded such representative of the entire church, as the ἄγγελος appears in the seven epistles. The latter view is taken by those who, appealing to Mal. ii. 7, iii. 1,[12] and, as to what refers to the symbol of the stars, to Dan. xii. 3, understand the ἄγγελοι, i.e., angels, as superintendents (*Vorsteher*), teachers, as bishops or presbyters.[13] So also R. Rothe,[14] who, however, in the angels of the churches perceives only "a prolepsis of bishops in the idea," i.e., regards the bishops as an ideal whose realization is still to be expected. Here finally belongs, also, Hengstenb., who nevertheless [15] regards the angels of every individual church, not as an individual, but as "the entire church government," i.e., the body of presbyters, — eventually with a bishop at the head,

[1] Chs. ii., iii., and also ch. iv. sqq.
[2] v. 20*b*.
[3] Cf. ii. 5.
[4] Cf. Matt. v. 14 sqq.
[5] vv. 4, 11.
[6] Chs. ii. and iii.
[7] Luke vii. 24, ix. 52; Jas. ii. 25; but certainly not 1 Tim. iii. 16, as Ebrard thinks.
[8] Phil. iv. 18; cf., also, Col. iv. 12.
[9] Cf. *De Synag. vet.*, iii. 2; 2, 3.
[10] Yet cf. II. p. 205.
[11] Concerning whom it could formerly have been thought otherwise, with Ewald. Yet Ew. ii., the mediator, i.e., the *Vorsteher*, of the church.
[12] Exod. xxiii. 20; Isa. xlii. 19; Ps. ciii. 20 sqq.; Hengstenb.
[13] Primas, Beda, N. de Lyra, Zeger, Drus., Alcas., C. a Lap., Bossuet, Beza, Grot., Calov., Herder, Kliefoth, etc.
[14] *Anfänge d. christl. Kirche*, i. p. 423 sqq.
[15] Cf. Brightman, Alsted.

— together with the deacons. This manner of exposition, which in its original simplicity always commends itself more than in its elaborate modifications by Rothe and Hengstb., is at variance partly with the use of the word ἄγγελος otherwise in the Apoc., and partly with the decisive circumstance, that, in the epistles which are directed to the ἄγγελος of each congregation, the relations of the congregations themselves are so definitely and directly treated, that, for the full explanation of this appearance, the view that the bishops or the entire governing body of the church are the representatives of their churches, besides not being in itself entirely justified, is not at all sufficient. Thus the view still remains, that, as Andr. and Areth. already say, the angel of the church is the church itself. In a certain analogy with xiv. 18, xvi. 5,[1] where the angel of the elements, as the nations and the individuals are called, the ἄγγελος of a church can be regarded[2] the personified spirit of the church.[3] This conception is not identical with that of the ἄγγεγος ἔφορος,[4] according to which, e.g., among the rabbins, the fundamental principle obtains, "God does not punish any people below without first casting down its chief from above,"[5] but has been formed in dependence thereon.[6] Against this, the objection cannot be made valid, that the article is absent before ἄγγελοι: for the question has to do only with what is comprised in ἄγγελοι τ. ἐκκλ., which is symbolized by the figure of the stars, without its being expressly marked here that the seven stars signify at any time one angel of the seven churches; just as, in the succeeding words, it is only expressly said that the seven candlesticks mean the seven churches, but not that the precise churches mentioned in ver. 11 are meant. But, as this designation of the conception is self-evident from the connection, so it is clearly inferred, from the superscription of the epistles which follow, that the *angels* of particular churches are meant. The most plausible objection against our exposition is made by Rothe; viz., that it is not proper, that, by the symbol of the stars, another symbol, viz., that of the angels, should be represented, especially alongside of the real ideas of the churches, which, also represented by a special symbol, are clearly distinguished from the ἄγγελοι τ. εκκλ. But[7] the ἄγγελοι τ. εκκλ. are to be regarded not at all as a symbol, but as — of course ideally — reality; and, according to this conception, to be in fact distinguished from churches that have been observed. If the ἐκκλησία, which is symbolized by the candlesticks, is considered, it appears variously composed of individual elements of various kinds, each of which is especially judged and treated of by the Lord; while, on the other hand, the ἄγγελος τ. ἐκκλησίας appears as the living unity of the one organism of the church, which, as it were, in mass clings to the Lord. Thus it is, that the epistles are directed, not to the angels of the churches, and besides

[1] Cf. vii. 1, ix. 11; Dan. x. 13, 20; Matt. xviii. 10; Deut. xxxii. 8 (LXX.).

[2] Cf. Salmas, *De episc. et presb.*, p. 183; Wetst., Züll., Bleek, etc.

[3] De Wette, Lücke, p. 432.

[4] So Hilgenf., Introd., p. 412. But the contents of the epistles do not harmonize with the idea of an actual guardian angel. Gebhardt, p. 39 sq., has accepted the presentation as above given.

[5] In Wetst.

[6] Cf. also Volkm., who, however, mentions also that the ἀγγ. ἔφορος has "his earthly substratum" in the president of the congregation.

[7] Cf. Lücke.

to the churches, as must be expected even according to Rothe's meaning, but only to the angel of each church; and yet in such way that their entirety as *one* person, *one* spiritual body, is declared. [See Note XXVII., p. 125.]

In conformity with the vision, ver. 12 sqq., and the epistles which in chs. ii. and iii. are directed to the seven churches,[1] must be the answer to the question as to what is the significance of these churches in the sense of the writer of the Apoc. Of the two chief views that are possible, according to which they appear either in purely historical definiteness, or in a certain typical position, the latter in the nature of the case has to be presented with many modifications, which, taken together, depend more or less upon an historical view; while, according to the former view,[2] there is no denial of a more general significance of the seven churches, at least in the sense that the epistles directed to them share the universal ecclesiastical relation of all the apostolic writings to particular congregations.[3] But against this opinion of Hengstenb., — who, in accordance with his false view of the relation of the section i. 4–iii. 22 to the whole book,[4] comprehends the seven churches collectively with the utmost limitation,[5] — is, first, the number seven;[6] and, secondly, the meaning of that vision wherein Christ appears in the midst of the seven candlesticks, i.e., churches, which therefore cannot be without a typical significance, since Christ is Lord and Saviour of all the churches (with which it also harmonizes well, that Christ writes to the *angels* of the churches; a conception, which, since it is of a more ideal nature, especially adapts itself to the fact that the churches, while appearing in all their historical definiteness, yet at the same time are found in a typical sense); and, thirdly and finally, the contents themselves of the letters, whose pertinence to the universal Church[7] is not only expressly emphasized,[8] but also concurs in its essential leading features with the chief thoughts of the entire book. But the significance of the seven churches is not to be limited to the entire Church of Asia Minor,[9] which only then, through this intermediate member, attains its further reference to the Church universal: rather, in the seven churches, the entire Church of Christ is regarded,[10] since it is a peculiarity of the writer of the Apoc. to present the general and ideal realistically, and in a definite, plastic way.[11] But with this it is also established, that all further determinations which have been connected, even by a play of words, with the

[1] Cf. vv. 4, 11.

[2] Wolf, Harenburg (who nevertheless understand seven Jewish and Judaeo-Christian schools found in Jerusalem, and named after the Asiatic cities), Herder, Lücke, — cf., on the other hand, Harenb., — De Wette, Bleek, Hengstenb., etc.

[3] Hengstenb.

[4] Cf. on ver. 4.

[5] Cf. Lücke, Ebrard, and already Vitr.

[6] For it is certain that in Colossæ and Hierapolis (Col. iv. 14), and probably, e.g., in Tralles and Magnesia (cf. the Letters of Ignatius), there were churches; so that John, for the sake of the significative number seven ("completeness is symbolized by the number seven," — N. de Lyra, etc.), is compelled to limit himself to those mentioned.

[7] Cf. already the Fragment of Muratori: "For although in the Apoc., John writes to the seven churches, yet he speaks to all." Wieseler's *Ausgabe* in the *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1847, p. 815 sqq.

[8] ii. 11, 17, etc.; cf. i. 3, xxii. 9, 18 sqq.

[9] As Lücke wishes.

[10] Victorin, Areth., Beda, N. de Lyra, Grot., De Wette, etc.

[11] Cf. the idea of the seven angels and (ver. 4) the seven spirits.

names of the individual congregations,[1] are entirely arbitrary. This applies especially to the strange controversy as to whether, in the seven epistles, the conditions of the Church of Christ be understood synchronistically, and that, too, eschatologically, i.e., so that only "at the end of Church history," immediately before Christ's return, are we to expect the corresponding forms of Christian Church-life;[2] or whether the prophetically portrayed conditions are to be understood consecutively of seven periods of Church history, succeeding one after another;[3] or, finally, whether they be partly consecutive and partly synchronistic.[4] The sort of foundations upon which such artificial interpretation is supported is shown, e.g., by Ebrard, who explains the first four epistles consecutively, because the promises in them[5] are regarded as derived "from consecutive epochs of O. T. history: Paradise, Death, the Departure from Egypt, the Kingdom of David." The context shows that John has in view particular circumstances of churches present to him, and therefore that the number *seven* of these churches is contemplated as a mirror of the entire Church.[6] In a chronological relation, the apocalyptic prophecy of these seven epistles extends just as far, and is limited in the same truly prophetic way, as the apocalyptics of the entire book, which gives the full explanation of the fundamental thought contained already in the vision, ver. 12 sqq., and the epistles belonging thereto; viz., the unfolding of the prophecy, "The Lord cometh."

Notes by the American Editor.

XV. Ver. 1. *ἣν ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς.*

Alford presents the argument on the other side: "Stern asks, 'How are we to understand this? Is not Christ very God, of one essence with the Father from eternity? Did he not, by virtue of the omniscience of his divine nature, know as exactly as the Father what should be the process of the world's history, what the fate of the Church? What purpose was served by a revelation from God to Jesus?' He proceeds to say that the words cannot refer to the revelation as made to *us*, but are clearly against such an interpretation; and gives, at some length and very well, that which, in one form or other, all will accept as the true explanation, in accordance with John vii. 16, xiv. 10, xvii. 7, 8. The

[1] "Ἔφεσος reminds them that they ought to be inflamed with the desire for eternal things, for ἔφεσις is desire." Grot. Cf. even Ebrard.

[2] Hofmann, *Weiss. u. Erfüll.*, ii. pp. 320, 324.

[3] Mede, Brightm., Vitr.

[4] Ebrard.

[5] ii. 7, 11, 17, 27.

[6] According to Kliefoth, *Zahlensymbolik der H. Schr. Theolog. Zeitsch.*, 1862, p. 53) what is consecutive lies just in the number *seven*. Similarly in *Commentar* (p. 271: "The number seven shows the development allotted the entire Church"). He understands the entire first part (i. 20*b*–iii. 22) as a statement of the ἃ εἰσὶν (i. 19), i.e., of those which are the things beheld (i. 10–18) for the present course of time, while i. 20*b* gives the meaning of vv. 10–18; and then in chs. ii. and iii. are portrayed the developments of Christianity originating in the present, before the "far in the future" final period beginning with iv. 1. Only in the last four epistles does Klief. find a reference to the *parousia*, as the circumstances portrayed therein are actually to extend in close consecutive chronological sequence until the epoch of the *parousia*. What is consecutive in the number seven, derived here (p. 163) from the order of the divine working, is referred, however, by Klief. (on xvii. 9, p. 210) to the relations of the anti-Christian world-power, which (iii. p. 258) is called "the final work of the Devil."

man Christ Jesus, even in his glorified state, receives from the Father, by his hypostatic union with him, that revelation which, by his Spirit, he imparts to his Church. For (Acts i. 7) the times and seasons are kept by the Father in his own power; and of the day and the hour knoweth no man, not the angels in heaven, nor even the Son, but the Father only (Mark xiii. 32). I may observe that the coincidence, in statement of this deep point of doctrine, between the Gospel of St. John and the Apocalypse, is at least remarkable."

XVI. Ver. 1. *διὰ τοῦ αγγέλου.*

Gebhardt (p. 40) maintains that the transference into an ecstasy cannot be regarded as showing the future; and, indorsing Düst.'s generic conception, defines the angel here as "the personification, so far as it respects the seer, of the whole revealing activity of God or Christ. With this idea alone, can we reconcile the fact that now this angel, and now that, sometimes, indeed, a voice, the voice of God, or Christ himself, speaks to the seer; and it is only on this principle that we can explain the manner in which, xxii. 6, the angel speaks of the angel of God being sent." This conception of the angel as a personification harmonizes with the interpretation of the angels of the churches.

Beck, however, says, "The article before *ἀγγ.*, according to the natural idiom, definitely presents an individual from the genus of angels, and the *αὐτοῦ* refers to Jesus Christ who sends; cf. xxii. 16. The designation 'his angel' is thoroughly consistent according to 1 Pet. iii. 22; cf. Matt. xiii. 41."

XVII. Ver. 4. *ἀπὸ ὁ ὢν.*

So also Trench: "Doubtless the immutability of God is intended to be expressed in this immutability of the name of God, in this absolute resistance to change or even modification which the name presents." Beck: "The name of the Immutable is presented in the form of immutability."

XVIII. Ver. 4. *ὁ ἐρχόμενος.*

Gebhardt (p. 21): "John does not use *ἐρχόμενος* as synonymous with *ἐσόμενος*, but in the sense of coming to judgment for the final completion of the eternal world-plan." Cremer (*Lexicon*): "In Rev. i. 4, 8, iv. 8, *ὁ ἐρχόμενος* denotes God as the God of the future revelation of salvation; cf. Isa. xl. 9: and the title (viz., *ὁ ὢν, κ.τ.λ.*), as a whole, is given to God, as the God of an eternal and unchangeable covenant." Tait: "The word *ἐρχόμενος* is the keynote of revelation. It runs like a silver thread throughout the entire book. It enters into it at the beginning, and it is summed up at the end by 'Surely I come quickly.'"

XIX. Ver. 4. *τῶν ἑπτὰ πνευμάτων.*

Trench: "There is no doubt, that, by 'the seven spirits,' we are to understand, not, indeed, the sevenfold operations of the Holy Ghost, but the Holy Ghost sevenfold in his operations. Neither need there be any difficulty in reconciling this interpretation, as Mede urges, with the doctrine of his personality. It is only that he is regarded here not so much in his personal unity as in his manifold energies, 1 Cor. xii. 4. The matter could not be put better than it is by Richard of St. Victor: 'Et a septem spiritibus, id est, a septiformi

Spiritu, qui simplex quidem est per naturam, septiformis per gratiam.'" Gerhard (*Loci Theologici*, xviii. 234): "By the seven spirits, the Spirit is to be understood metonymically, of whom the Church sings that he is *septiformis munere*. This paraphrase is to be understood by synecdoche; viz., in the sense that the Holy Spirit is the author and giver, not only of seven but of all spiritual charisms. John, however, employs the number seven, because it is the number of perfection, and denotes multiplicity (Amos i. 6; Prov. xxiv. 15; Ps. cxix. 164; Isa. iv. 1). This interpretation is proved: 1. From the quality and condition of what is predicated. John prays for grace and peace to the seven churches, from the seven spirits. But the bestowment of grace and peace, i.e., spiritual and heavenly blessings, is the part of no creature, but of God alone; and hence the apostles, in their epistles, never pray that grace may be given those to whom they write, from angels or from any other creature, but only from God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, because it is only God who is the author of grace and peace. 2. From the equal conjunction of the seven spirits with God the Father and the Son. John prays that grace and peace be given the churches equally 'from him which is, and which was, and which is to come; and from the seven spirits, and from Jesus Christ;' and that, too, by a mode of invocation in which the ἀπὸ is thrice repeated, and the seven spirits assigned the same degree of dignity with the Father and the Son. 3. From the order and position. The seven spirits are interposed between the Father and the Son. Therefore created spirits or angels cannot be understood; for, whenever angels are joined with God and Christ as ministers, they are subjoined (1 Tim. v. 21; Rev. iii. 5: the intention of the passage, Mark xiii. 32, is different, where the discourse rises to a climax)," etc. Cf., also, in the "Veni Creator Spiritus," ascribed by many to Charlemagne, by others to Gregory the Great, referred to above by Gerhard, —

"Tu septiformis munere,"

as paraphrased in the most widely used English translation, —

"Thou the anointing Spirit art,
Who dost thy sevenfold gifts impart."

Luther's rendering —

"Du bist mit Gaben siebenfalt" —

more closely conforms to the original and the strict meaning of the passage, although the "sevenfold gifts" or "operations" is a necessary inference, and is sustained by such passages as Isa. xi. 2, 3.

XX. Ver. 5. *ὁ πρωτότοκος.*

Cf. Meyer on 1 Cor. xv. 20; Col. i. 18. Others, indeed, were raised from the dead before Christ's resurrection, e.g., the daughter of Jairus, and Lazarus; yet they were not raised to immortal life, but their souls were re-invested with mortal bodies. See the contrast drawn by Rom. vi. 9; also, in this chapter, v. 18.

XXI. Ver. 5. *καὶ λύσαντι.*

Beck, who, however, prefers the reading *λούσαντι*, adds on the *ἐν τῷ αἵματι*: "For it is not the material, lifeless blood of one dead, but the spiritually quickened blood of the risen One, i.e., of one born anew by the resurrection, of the

spiritually glorified Son of man. The sin-cleansing efficacy of the blood of Christ is, therefore, one that works inwardly, cleansing the heart and mind, towards God (Heb. ix. 14; cf. vii. 16, x. 19–21). *λούειν* is, therefore, not merely judicial liberation from sin as a debt, nor moral liberation from the bondage of sin (as two parties of exegetes here try to maintain), but one divine act accomplished in the person, whereby the habitual, sinful nature of the human heart and mind, discontent with God, and hostility towards him, are removed, and changed into a communion of peace and love with God, into a new habit, whence, at last, the personal freedom from sin, and sanctification in God, result." Tait: "Tell us not, then, that the death of Christ was merely that of a martyr, a spectacle before men and angels of the dignity of self-sacrifice, — that it was intended to reconcile man to God by preaching to us, through a mortal, the evil of sin and the majesty of sorrow."

XXII. Ver. 6. *ἱερεῖς τῷ θεῷ.*

On the relation of *ἱερεῖς* to the preceding verse, Plumptre refers to the consecration, as priests, of Aaron and his sons, by the sprinkling of blood, and adds: "The two ideas of being cleansed with blood, and of entering on a priest's work, were accordingly closely linked together. But, in that baptism of blood of which St. John thought, the washing was not limited to any priestly family, but was co-extensive with the whole company of believers. They, therefore, had become what the older Israel of God was at first meant to be in idea and constitution, 'a kingdom of priests.' That sprinkling of blood upon the whole people, before the great apostasy of the golden calf, had been the symbol that they, too, were all consecrated, and set apart for their high calling (Exod. xx. 6, 10, xxiv. 8). So John (in this instance, also following in the track of the Epistle to the Hebrews) looked on the true priests' work as not limited to any order of the Church's ministry."

XXIII. Ver. 7. *μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν.*

Luthardt interprets the clouds as "in heavenly glory." Trench, on the other hand, maintains that they belong "not to the glory and gladness, but the terror and anguish, of that day. The clouds have nothing in common with the *νεφέλη φωτεινή* (Matt. xvii. 5), 'the glorious privacy of light,' into which the Lord was withdrawn, for a while, from the eyes of his disciples at the transfiguration; but are rather the symbols or fit accompaniments of judgment (Ps. xcvii. 2; cf. xviii. 11; Nah. i. 3; Isa. xix. 11)." Both ideas, however, are reconcilable, according as those who contemplate Christ's coming are believing or unbelieving.

XXIV. Ver. 7. *οἵτινες αὐτὸν ἐξεκέντησαν.*

Alford: "The persons intended in this expression are, beyond doubt, those to whom our Lord prophesied in like terms, Matt. xxvi. 64; viz., those who were his murderers, whether the Jews who delivered him to be crucified, or the Romans who actually inflicted his death."

XXV. Ver. 10. *ἐν τῇ κυριακῇ ἡμέρᾳ.*

Trench: "Some have assumed, from this passage, that *ἡμέρα κυριακή* was a designation of Sunday already familiar among Christians. This, however,

seems a mistake. The name had, probably, its origin here. A little later, we find *ἡμέρα κυριακή* familiar to Ignatius, as *Dominica solemnia* to Tertullian (*De Anima*, c. 9; cf. Dionysius of Corinth, quoted by Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 23, 8; Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.*, vii. 12; Origen, *Con. Cels.*, viii. 22). But, though the name 'the Lord's Day' will very probably have had here its rise (the actual form of the phrase may have been suggested by *κυριακὸν δεῖπνον*, 1 Cor. xi. 20), the thing, the celebration of the first day of the week as that on which the Lord brake the bands of death, and became the head of a new creation, called therefore sometimes *ἀναστάσιμος ἡμέρα*, — this was as old as Christianity itself (John xx. 24–29; 1 Cor. xvi. 2; Acts xx. 7; Epistle of Barnabas, c. 17)." A refutation of the interpretation as "the day of the Lord's coming" is given in Alford.

XXVI. Ver. 12. *ἑπτὰ λυχνίας χρυσᾶς.*

Alford notes the change from the seven-branched candlestick of the temple, as symbolizing the loss of outward unity, so that "each local church has now its own candlestick." So Trench: "The Christian Church is at once 'the Church' and the 'churches.'" Plumptre: "What he needed was to bring out clearly the individuality of each society." Tait: "These candlesticks were of gold, to denote the preciousness of every thing connected with the Church, and, we may add, the beauty of the Church and her holy services."

XXVII. Ver. 20. *ἄγγελοι τῶν ἑπτὰ ἐκκλησιῶν.*

In harmony with Düst., Gebhardt (p. 39): "'The angel of the church' represents it as a unity, an organization, as a moral person, a living whole, in which one member depends upon and affects the others, in which a definite spirit reigns, and by which one church is distinguished from another." Lange: "The personified character or life-picture of the Church."

Weiss (*Bibl. Theol. of N. T.*, ii. 270) regards the angels of the churches as "their protecting angels." Alford's long argument is to the same effect.

Supporting the view that the angels are the superintendents, pastors, or bishops, are: Cremer (*Lexicon*): "To see in *ἄγγελοι* here a personification of the spirit of the community in its 'ideal reality' (as again Düsterdieck has recently done), is not merely without any biblical analogy, — for such a view derives no support from Dan. x. 13, 20; Deut. xxxii. 8; LXX., — but must also plainly appear an abstraction decidedly unfavorable to the import and effect of the epistles. It would have been far more effective, in this case, to have written *τῇ ἐν . . . ἐκκλησίᾳ γράψον*. Assuming the *ἄγγ. τῶν ἐκκλησ.* to be those to whom the churches are intrusted, the only question is, To what sphere do they belong, the terrestrial or the super-terrestrial? Their belonging to the earthly sphere is supported above all by the *address* of the epistles; secondly, by the circumstance that the writer of the Apocalypse could not act as messenger between two super-terrestrial beings (cf. Rev. i. 1, xxii. 6); and, further, by the consideration that, as the candlesticks, so also the stars, must belong to one and the same sphere. But, if by this expression we are to understand men, it is natural to think of Acts xx. 28; 1 Pet. v. 2; and that, too, so that these *ἐπίσκοποι* or *πρεσβύτεροι* are those whose business it is to execute the will or commission of the Lord, in general as well as in special cases, to the churches, as those whom the Lord has appointed representatives of the churches, and to whom he has intrusted their care: cf. Acts xx. 28; Mal. ii. 7." Stier: "Persons who

stood before the Lord's view, as the representative leaders of the church, with or without prominent office, but in prominent spiritual position, and therefore assumed to be the receivers of that which was to be said in the church. They are by no means collectively the 'teaching order,' or 'the eldership,' or any thing of the kind, but actual individual persons." Philippi (*Kirchl. Glaubenlehre*, v. 3, 287): "The ἄγγελος here is neither to be spiritualized as the personification of the spirit of the congregation, nor also to be taken collectively as the entire official body, or presbytery, of the church. But, as the spirit of the congregation is represented in the presbytery, so was the spirit of the presbytery in its official body, or bishop; and therefore he also, as not merely the official, but, at the same time, the spiritual summit of the entire body, is chiefly responsible for its spirit." Luthardt: "God's messengers, who speak in God's name, therefore here *die Vorsteher*." Trench argues at length (pp. 75–83) that the term can refer only to a bishop, and that, too, "not merely a ruling elder, a *primus inter pares*, with only such authority and jurisdiction as the others, his peers, have lent him." Plumptre: "The word 'angels' might well commend itself, at such a time, as fitted to indicate the office for which the received terminology of the Church offered no adequate expression. Over and above its ordinary use, it had been applied by the prophet whose writings had been brought into a new prominence by the ministry of the Baptist, to himself as a prophet (Mal. i. 1), to the priests of Israel (Mal. ii. 7), to the forerunner of the Lord (Mal. iii. 1). It had been used of those whom, in a lower sense, the Lord had sent to prepare his way before him (Luke ix. 52), and whose work stood on the same level as that of the seventy. Here, then, seemed to be that which met the want. So far as it reminded men of its higher sense, it testified that the servants of God, who had been called to this special office, were to 'lead on earth an angel's life;' that they, both in the liturgical and the ministerial aspects of their work, were to be as those who, in both senses, were 'ministering spirits' in heaven (Heb. i. 14). It helped also to bring the language of the Revelation into harmony with that of the great apocalyptic work of the Old Testament, the prophecy of Daniel. On the other hand, we need not wonder that it did not take a permanent place in the vocabulary of the Church. The old associations of the word were too dominant, the difficulty of distinguishing the new from the old too great, to allow of its being generally accepted." Tait: "This name is not, certainly, applied elsewhere in the New Testament to a bishop, nor is it applied to a presbyter; but it is in perfect accord with the symbolical character of the book in which it occurs, and is admirably adapted to express the nature of the office, and the responsibilities of those to whom the spiritual charge of the several churches was committed."

CHAPTER II.

Instead of the rec. Ἐφεσίνης, ver. 1, Griesbach already, according to preponderating testimonies, has written ἐν Ἐφέσῳ. In this way, the designation of place is to be read in the superscriptions of all seven epistles: cf., ver. 8, the variation ἐκκλ. Σμυρναίων; likewise iii. 14. But it is doubtful whether, instead of τῆς (2, 3, 6, 7, al., Verss., Griesb., Tisch., etc.), Lach. has correctly written τῷ (cf. already Beng.). This τῷ, Lach. has, besides, in ver. 1, where A, C, testify to it; also ver. 8 (where, however, C has neither τῷ nor τῆς). Yet the authority of A, which C once contradicts, and with which, at least once, it does not agree, seems too weak to compel the removal of the scarcely unnecessary τῆς, which is certain also in most MSS. ℵ has it throughout. Bengel's opinion (*Gnomon* on ver. 1) that the τῷ (vv. 1, 12, 18), or the τῆς, was chosen in accord with the contents of the epistle, is refuted by the testimonies which allow it to be read only in the way proposed by Lach. — Ver. 2. The σου after κόπον (rec.) is absent in A, C, Vulg., al., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.], and is defended by B, ℵ, not against exegetical considerations. — Instead of ἐπειράσω (Erasm., rec.) read ἐπείρασας, according to A, B, C, ℵ, 2, 6, 7, al., with Griesb., Matth., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]. Instead of the rec. φάσκοντας εἶναι ἀποστόλους, read λέγοντας ἑαυτοὺς ἀποστόλους, according to A, B, ℵ, 18, 25, al. (cf. ver. 20), with Griesb., Lach. [W. and H.]: and that, too, without the addition of εἶναι (cf. ver. 9), which Beng., Matth., Tisch., have according to 6, 7, 8, 9, al., Verss., Primas, Andr. — Ver. 3. The rec., with its two pairs of members, καὶ ἐβαστ. κ. ὑπομον. ἔχεις and καὶ διὰ τ. ὀνομ. μ. κεκοπίακας καὶ οὐ κέκμηκας, originates from an interpreter. According to a more correct reading, the parallelism of members falls away, as it should be καὶ ὑπομονὴν ἔχεις, καὶ ἐβάστασας διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου (A, B, C, 2, 3, 4, al., Verss., Beng., Griesb., Matth., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]), καὶ οὐ κεκοπίακες (A, C, Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]); for which latter form (cf. ver. 4, ἀφῆκες in C), Beng. has written κεκοπίακας, Mill (*Prol.*, 1109) and Griesb. have preferred ἐκοπίασας (2, 3, 4, ℵ, al., Andr., Areth.), which, however, is introduced because of the aor. ἐβαστ. — Ver. 5. Rec., ἐκπέπτωκας (Andr.), against A, C, 2, 4, al., Verss., Areth., which have πέπτωκας (Griesb., Matth., Lach., Tisch.) [πέπτωκες, W. and H.]. — The ταχύ (Var., τάχει, Erasm., Steph., 1, 3, Beng.) in Complut., Steph., 2, against A, C, ℵ, Vulg., al., Lach., Tisch., originates from a comparison with ver. 16, iii. 11, etc. — Ver. 7. The false form νικοῦντι is received by Lach. It is, of course, noteworthy that this is found also at ver. 17 in A; nay, even there, according to Lach., also in C; so that it can scarcely be a slip of the pen. — Instead of ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ παραδείσου (rec.), read ἐν τῳ παραδ., according to all important witnesses (Beng., Griesb., Matth., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]). — The omission of the μου after θεοῦ (rec., Lach., Tisch., IX. [W. and H.]) is favored by A, C, ℵ; on the other hand (Beng., Griesb., Matth., Tisch.), 2, 4, 6, 7, al., Vulg., Syr., Aeth., Orig., Cypr., al., are for its reception, as well as what is decisive, viz., the circumstance that the theological interests would be easily opposed to the μου; as, e.g., Arethas expressly remarks, with a reference to John

xx. 17, that the expression τ. θεοῦ μου contains nothing offensive. Cod. 26 (Wetst.) has changed the not-favored μου into σου. — Ver. 9. τὰ ἔργα καὶ. Rec. (ℵ) against A, C, 19, Vulg., Copt., Aeth. (Beng., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]). Also, in ver. 13, the addition has entered from ver. 2, 19, iii. 1, 8, 15. — Before the τῶν λεγ., an ἐκ is to be supplied in the rec. (A, B, C, ℵ, 2, 6, 7, al., Verss., Beng., etc.). — Ver. 10. Instead of μηδὲν (Vulg., rec., ℵ, Beng., Tisch.), read μή, (A, B, C, 8, Andr., Lach. [W. and H.]. — The particle δή, after ἰδού (2, 4, 6, 8, al., Areth., Compl., Matth., Tisch.), may be regarded as a stylistic addition which does not correspond to the literary character of the Apoc. Lach. agrees with the rec. (ℵ, Tisch. IX. [W. and H.]), which does not have the δή. — The rec. ἕξετε (Vulg., ℵ: ἔξεται; Beng., Griesb., Matth., Tisch.) can stand against the reading ἔχητε (A, Lach. [W. and H.]) the less, as C also, by its ἔχεται (according to Wetst.: ἔχετε), testifies to this. — Ver. 13. The omission of the καὶ before ἐν τ. ἡμ. (2, 4, 6, 7, al., in Wetst., five codd., b. Matth., ℵ, Syr., Aeth., Ar., Compl., Beng., Matth., Tisch., against A, C, Vulg., rec., Lach.), and, afterwards, the omission of the ὃς in some few codd. in Wetst. and Beng. (so Luth.; cf., also, Ewald), should serve for a relief of the construction which essentially depends thereon, whether after the ἡμέραις, ἐν αἷς (Andr., rec., Beng., Griesb.), or αἷς (2, 4, 6, 9, al., in Wetst., four codd. in Matth.; so Matth., Tisch.), or ἐμαῖς (Erasm., Luth.), or, finally, all this fall away (A, C, Vulg., Copt., Treg., Lach., Tisch. IX. [W. and H.]). It is *possible* for the αἷς to fall away because of the preceding ἡμέρως, but the addition is more probably meant to aid the construction. — Ver. 14. The ὅτι (A, ℵ, rec., Tisch., IX.) comes from vv. 4, 20. — τῷ Βαλ. So Beng., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.], according to A, C. A correction is τὸν, B (rec.); through reiteration from ἐδίδασκεν, arise the var. ἐν τῷ, B (Luther), "through *Balak*." Cf., also, Winer, p. 213. — Ver. 15. The art. before Νικολ. (rec., ℵ, Tisch. IX.) is to be deleted (A, C, 6, 11, al., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]). — Instead of ὃ μισῶ (rec., Beng.), read ὁμοίως, C, A, ℵ, many minusc., Vulg., Syr., Andr., Areth., al., Beng. in *Gnom.*, Griesb., Matth., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]. The compounds, ὁμοίως ὁ μισ. and ὁμ. ἣν μισ. (cf. Wetst., Beng.), are also found. — Ver. 16. After μεταν., the οὖν (A, C, minusc., Griesb., Matth., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]) is absent in the rec., but also in ℵ, Tisch. IX. — Ver. 17. The gloss φαγεῖν ἀπὸ, before τοῦ μαν. (rec. against the prevailing testimonies), is in no way supported by Arethas (cf. Matth.). — For ἔγνω (rec.), read οἶδεν (A, B, C, ℵ, 2, al., Beng., etc.). — Ver. 18. The αὐτου, after ὀφθαλμ. (cf. i. 14), is to be erased (A, C, Lach.). Likewise, ver. 19, the καί before τὰ εσχ. — Ver. 20. From ver. 14, ὀλίγα is introduced (rec., ℵ: πολύ); against A, C, many minusc., Verss., Beng., Griesb., etc. Instead of the explanatory ἐᾷς (rec.), read ἀφεῖς (A, C, ℵ, minusc., Beng., Griesb., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]), whence, also, the emendations, ἀφίης, ἀφῆκας, are derived. — The rec.: γυν. Ἰεσαβ. (Beng., Treg. [W. and H.]) is sufficiently supported by C, ℵ, Vulg., and, in an exegetical respect, to be decidedly preferred to the reading σου Ἰεσ. (many minusc., in Wetst., and Matth., Griesb., Tisch.). — The rec.: τὴν λέγουσ. is, like the variation ἣ λέγει (in Wetst.), an interpretation of the correct ἡ λέγουσα (A, C, ℵ, Beng., Griesb., etc.). — καὶ διδάσκει καὶ πλανᾷ. So, according to A, C, ℵ, many minusc., Syr., Copt., Compl., already Beng., Griesb. The rec.: διδάσκειν καὶ πλανᾶσθαι (Vulg.: *docere et seducere*) is an alteration which Areth. more correctly attains by his διδ. κ. πλανᾶν. — Ver. 21. Instead of καὶ οὐ θέλει (οὐκ ἠθέλησεν, A), μετανοῆσαι ἐκ τῆς πορν. αυτ. (A, C, minusc., Verss., Beng., Griesb., Matth., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]), the rec. has the ἐκ τ. πορν. αὐτ. before καὶ οὐ, and then only μετανόησεν. The shortest, and perhaps original, reading is that of ℵ$_1$: ἵνα μεταν. ἐκ τ.

πορν. ταύτης. — Ver. 22. The ἐγώ before βάλλω (rec.) is incorrect (A, C, 2, 4, al., Beng., Griesb., etc.). The καλῶ in the ℵ is a clerical error. — For κλίνην, A has the poor gloss φυλακήν. — The modification ἐργ. αὐτῶν (rec.) is found already in A, against B, ℵ, 2, 3, etc.; αὐτῆς is rejected already by Beng. and Griesb. — Ver. 24. Instead of καὶ λοιπ. (rec.), read τοῖς λοιπ. (A, C, al., Beng., Griesb., etc.; cf. the variations καὶ τοῖς λοιπ.). The καὶ before οἵτινες is incorrect (A, C, ℵ, Vulg., al., Beng., Griesb., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]). — The fut. βαλῶ (rec., ℵ; cf. Vulg., Primas) is an explanation of the correct reading βάλλω (A, C, al., Matth., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]). — Ver. 27. συντρίβεται. So, correctly, (A, C, ℵ), the recensions and later editions. The var. συντριβήσεται (2, 3, 4, 6, al., Vulg., Syr., Compl.) is an inept explanation (cf. Luth., *Soll er sie zerschmeissen*), which Areth. wishes to justify exegetically by making the ὡς not comparative but final.

All seven epistles (chs. ii. and iii.)[1] are not only like one another in their dependence upon the same fundamental thought,[2] viz., the advent of the Lord, since they explain and apply it, as often as presented,[3] in a manifold way; but they are also skilfully planned and forcibly elaborated according to a scheme.[4] The epistles naturally fall into *three* chief divisions, — title, body of the epistle, and conclusion. Since what are properly the superscriptions proceed from the command of the Lord, in whose name John is to write, the *titles* contain after the uniform introductory formula Τάδε λέγει, expressed after the manner of the ancient prophets,[5] such a self-designation of Christ speaking to the churches as agrees with the visionary revelation,[6] or with the designation of the Lord placed at the head of the book,[7] and by its consolations, warnings, and threats, is significant with respect to the contents themselves of the epistles.[8] *What is properly the epistle* is always opened with a prominent presentation of the fact that the Lord knows all the relations of his churches (οἶδα, κ.τ.λ.); then, connected with this are praise and reproof, the statement of present and future perils and troubles, and an admonition to repentance, encouragement, consolation, warning, threats, in accordance with the circumstances presented.[9] The *conclusion* is always divided into two parts, and has a decidedly very general significance, so that each individual epistle calls to mind the more general meaning[10] found in the whole seven. The two members of the conclusion contain exhortations directed to every one who has ears to hear the address of the Spirit to the churches, and a promise to victors, pointing to the final completion of Christ's kingdom; so that thus, even in these closing verses, there is an intimation of the goal before all Apoc. prophecy, — the coming of the Lord. It is, besides, to be remarked concerning both these members,[11] that in the first three epistles the exhortation precedes and the promise follows,[12] while in the last four epistles the order is reversed;[13] so that the number seven seems intentionally

[1] Cf. Heinrichs, ii. p. 195 sqq. *Excurs.* I., *De Sept. illis Epp. Apocalypt.*

[2] Cf. i. 7.

[3] ii. 5, 16, iii. 3, 11, 20.

[4] Cf. also Beng., Ew., De Wette, Hengstenb., Ebrard.

[5] Am. i. 3, 6, 9, 10, 13, ii. 1, 4, 6. Cf. Ewald.

[6] i. 12 sqq. [7] i. 5.

[8] Cf. ii. 1 and 5, 8 and 10, 12 and 16, 18 and 23, 27.

[9] ii. 2–6, 9, 10, 13–16, 19–25, iii. 1–4, 8–11, 15–20.

[10] Cf. on i. 20.

[11] Cf. Beng., Ew., De Wette, etc.

[12] ii. 7, 11, 17.

[13] ii. 26–29, iii. 5, 6, 12, 13, 21, 22.

resolved into three and four, as also elsewhere, although no consequence dare be inferred therefrom concerning the relation of the churches to each other.[1]

Vv. 1–7. The epistle to the church (the angel of the church, cf. i. 20) at Ephesus.

Ver. 1. Ephesus, vying with Smyrna (ver. 8) and Pergamos (ver. 12) for the precedence in Asia, is called πρώτη μητρόπολις[2] (first metropolis). But neither does this political relation determine the precedency of the three churches, nor is Ephesus named at the head of them all as the proper residence of John, as Hengstenb. asserts under the presumption of the Apostolic-Johannean authenticity of the Apoc.: cf. on i. 11. — At Ephesus, which, in the times of the Apostle Paul, was the chief city of Ionia, lying on the Cayster and near the sea, known for its worship of Diana,[3] and especially distinguished for its trade and fine Grecian culture,[4] and at present in ruins, alongside of which is the village of Ajosoluk,[5] Paul had collected a congregation of Jews, and especially of heathen, and had cherished it with great love.[6] At his departure he spoke of the dangerous errors with which the churches would be visited,[7] of which there is still no trace in the Epistle to the Ephesians, not even in Eph. iv. 14, v. 6. At the time of 1 Tim. i. 3, Timothy was superintending the church there: many expositors who regard the "angel" of the church as the bishop imagine, therefore, under a double error, that our Apocalyptic epistle is directed to Timothy.[8] Cf. also Introduction, sec. 3. The designation of the Lord, in whose name the prophet writes, is from i. 13, 16, only that instead of ἔχων we find now κρατῶν τ. ἑπτ. ἀστ., so that Christ is presented as though he held the stars fast,[9] protecting and supporting them, so that it depends only upon him,[10] if possibly by an act of judgment he cast them out of his hand.[11] So, also, is the περιπατῶν, κ.τ.λ., in comparison with i. 13, where Christ appears altogether in the midst of the candlesticks. Yet even in the περιπατεῖν there does not lie so much the idea of walking to and fro, as rather that his presence is a living and actual one.[12] — The entire designation of Christ, which in general expresses his essential relation to the churches, occurs on that account fittingly in the *first* of the seven epistles, which, indeed, form not a mere aggregate of accidental individualities, but, as the number seven already shows, an important unity. Even in the manifestation of Christ, what first meets the eyes of the seer is how the Lord is in the midst of the candlesticks.[13] In no way, therefore, does "this item inwardly and strictly cohere with the metropolitan posi-

[1] Hengstenb.

[2] Cf. Wolf.

[3] Acts xix.

[4] In Plautus (*Mil. Glor.*, iii. 1, 42 sqq.), a witty fellow (*cavillus lepidus, facetus*) excuses himself for having been born at Ephesus; and not without cause does the apostle warn the Ephesians (v. 4) of εὐτραπελία.

[5] Cf. Th. Smith, *Septem Asiae Ecclesiarum Notitia*, Oxon., 1672; Züllig, *Beigabe*, 2; Winer, *Realwörterb.*, i. 389.

[6] Acts xviii. 19, xix. 1 sqq., xx. 17 sqq.

[7] Acts xx. 22 sqq.

[8] So the expositors whom N. de Lyra mentions, but does not indorse (Viegas, Alcasar, C. a Lap, etc. Not so, Ribera, Stern).

[9] ii. 25, iii. 11.

[10] John x. 28.

[11] Cf. ver. 5, iii. 16.

[12] Cf. Lev. xxvi. 12; Sir. xxiv. 5.

[13] i. 13.

tion of the Ephesian congregations as the universal type of the apostolical church."[1]

Ver. 2. Τὰ ἔργα σου are not "Christian deeds of heroism against false teachers," as Hengstenb. thinks;[2] who, partly because of the otherwise inexplicable ver. 4, partly in order not to maintain a repetition with respect to the ὑπομονή, ver. 3, and partly because of ver. 6,[3] understands all of vv. 2, 3, as referring to conduct towards false teachers, the κόπος as work against them, while the ὑπομονή, ver. 2, signifies "active" and ver. 3 "passive" patience in suffering, which true confessors experience because of their zeal against them. All this is arbitrary. By τὰ ἔργα σου, the external activity in general, whereby the Church manifests its inner life, is designated. The works ("fruits," Matt. vii. 16 sqq.) cannot be evil (vv. 6, 22, iii. 1, 15, xvi. 11, xviii. 6; cf. Rom. ii. 6 sqq.). It is the entire — and here praiseworthy[4] — conversation of the church,[5] including their bearing under suffering,[6] that is here meant. This is shown by what follows, where the works are more accurately explained in a twofold respect, καὶ τὸν κόπον κ. τ. ὑπομ. σου and καὶ ὅτι οὐ δύνῃ βαστ. κακ.[7] Just because the σου does not stand after κόπον, but only after (τ. κοπ. καὶ) τ. ὑπομονὴν (i. 14), these two ideas cohere the more intimately, but not as hendiadys;[8] while as the second point the καὶ οὐ δύνῃ, κ.τ.λ., is rendered prominent.[9] Just as in 1 Cor. xv. 58, the κόπος of believers with their firm steadfastness is required for realizing the ἔργον of the Lord, both are here mentioned; viz., the κόπος, i.e., the toilsome labor,[10] and the ὑπομονή, i.e., the necessary patient perseverance, as a chief item in the ἔργα.[11] The κόπος, together with the ὑπομονή, refers to all wherein believers fulfil their peculiar holy task with divine and spiritual power and endurance, — a work which, in its most manifold forms, is always combined with hardship (κόπος), and therefore cannot be fulfilled without ὑπομονή, as this is essentially and necessarily conditioned by the antagonism between the kingdom of Christ and the world. — The second commendation[12] is, that the Lord knows the "works" of the church at Ephesus, that it "cannot bear them which are evil" (κακούς without the article). Concerning the form δύνῃ,[13] cf. Wetstein and Winer. The βαστάζειν makes us think of the κακοί as a heavy burden.[14] The expression κακούς[15] designates those meant properly according to their perverted and worthless nature, which, however, in the sense of the prophet, already according to the O. T. view, cannot be estimated otherwise than by the measure of the positive divine norm. Thus "they which are evil" are in some sort of contradiction to the divine truth, whereby the inner and outward life of believers is determined; hence the actual intolerance towards them, or[16] the necessary hatred of their godless nature.[17] — καὶ ἐπείρασας τ. λεγ.

[1] Ebrard. [2] Cf. also Heinr.
[3] See exposition of verse.
[4] Without saying, therefore, that I approve the οἶδα (N. de Lyra).
[5] Ew., De Wette, Ebrard.
[6] Calov. [7] Cf. Ew.
[8] Grot., Heinr.
[9] Against Ebrard.
[10] Cf. 1 Thess. i. 3, ii. 9; 2 Cor. vi. 5.
[11] Cf. also, in xiv. 13, the correlation of the general ἔργον and the more definite κόπος.
[12] Cf. also ver. 6.
[13] Mark ix. 22.
[14] 2 Kings xviii. 14; Matt. xx. 12; Gal. vi. 2; Acts xvi. 10, 28.
[15] Not πονηρούς. See on xvi. 2.
[16] Ver. 6.
[17] Cf. Ps. cxxxix. 21 sqq.

ἑαυτ. ἀποστόλους, κ.τ.λ. The praiseworthy conduct of the church towards those that are evil, who are here more accurately designated as false teachers, is still further acknowledged (until ψευδεῖς). Πειράζειν, synonymous with δοκιμάζειν[1] and correlate with τό δοκίμιον, δοκίμον γένεσθαι,[2] is more the practical putting to the test, the trial from living experience. In 1 John iv. 1, where the question is treated solely with respect to a definite confession, δοκιμάζειν properly occurs: in this place, on the other hand, the πειράζειν indicates that works especially[3] come into consideration. Hence the connection of our false apostles with the false prophets, 1 John iv.,[4] is inapposite. — Those here meant call themselves apostles, and yet are not; so the result of the proof is that they are found liars. Those men must, therefore, like the false apostles at Corinth,[5] have professed themselves as sent immediately from the Lord himself.[6] If in so doing they should have appealed to their intercourse with Christ as long as he was on earth,[7] — which, however, is not indicated, — it would of course follow that "that was the apostolic age." But, at any rate, this declaration has sense only at the time which occurs about the Pauline period, i.e., possibly up to the destruction of Jerusalem; but not at the end of the first century, where a trace nowhere occurs of a false teacher laying claim to apostolic authority. — As to the character of the false teachers, cf. ver. 6. — [See Note XXVIII., p. 155.]

Ver. 3. As in ver. 2 (καὶ ἐπείρασας, κ.τ.λ.) that is amplified which was briefly indicated by the words καὶ ὅτι οὐ δύνῃ βαστάσαι κακούς, so now, also, the first point of the acknowledgment (τ. κοπ. κ. τ. ὑπομ. σου) is developed on a definite side, and that, too, so that not only with ὑπομονὴν ἔχεις the above ὑπομονὴν σου is again taken up, but also the ἐκβάστασας διὰ τ. ὄν. μου[8] is placed in a significant antithesis to the οὐ δύνῃ βαστάσαι κακούς, and by the καὶ οὐ κεκοπίακες[9] it is indicated that the κόπος of believers furnished with the right ὑπομονή has resulted neither in succumbing nor weariness. Beng.: "I know thy labor; yet thou dost not labor, i.e., shalt not be broken down by labor."[10]

Vv. 4, 5. In sharp antithesis to the praise,[11] follows (ἀλλὰ) the declaration of what the Lord has against the church;[12] viz., that it has left, i.e., given up, its first love.[13] The πρώτην is not to be taken as comparative, nor is it to be inferred in the sense in itself correct, that the Greek superlative has a comparative force;[14] rather, the love is regarded as actually the first, i.e., that which was actually present at the beginning of the life of faith.[15] This ἀγάπη certainly is not "the sedulous care and vigilance with fervor and zeal for the purity of the divine word against false prophets,"[16] which is impossible already, because of ver. 2 (δύνῃ pres.). Opposed to this, but just as

[1] 2 Cor. xiii. 5.
[2] 1 Pet. i. 6; Jas. i. 2, 12.
[3] Cf. ver. 6.
[4] Hengstenb.
[5] 2 Cor. xi. 14, 23.
[6] Not from the church at Jerusalem (Ewald).
[7] Beng.
[8] Cf. Matt. x. 22; Luke xxi. 17; John xv. 21.
[9] Cf. Isa. xl. 31; Ps. vi. 7; John iv. 6; Matt. xi. 28.
[10] Cf. Vitr., Wolf., Ew., Ebrard, etc.
[11] Vv. 2, 3.
[12] Cf. Matt. v. 23.
[13] De Wette. Cf. Rom. i. 27; Mark viii. 8; Prov. iv. 13, where is the contrary φυλάσσειν.
[14] Ew., Winer, p. 229.
[15] Cf. N. de Lyra, Areth., De Wette, Hengstenb., Ebrard, Ew. ii., etc.
[16] Calov. Cf. also Vitr.

inappropriate, is the explanation of Eichhorn: "You are restraining the wicked teachers too captiously and severely." The reference appears specially to apply to the care of the poor;[1] it is altogether difficult to regard it alone of brotherly love,[2] but of that only so far as it is the manifestation of love to God and Christ, which the indefinite expression may suggest. Züllig and Hengstenb. have properly recalled Jer. ii. 2. The lovely description of the fellowship of believers with God as that of a bridal or marriage relation[3] is particularly applicable to the foundation of the grace of God appearing in Christ,[4] and still to be hoped for from him.[5] Against this exposition an appeal cannot therefore be made[6] to vv. 2, 3; since even where the *first* love has vanished, and works springing only from the purest glow of this first love are no longer found (ver. 5), the power of faith and love to the Lord is still sufficient for the works praised in vv. 2 and 3. — To the reproof (ver. 4) is added the call to repentance, and, in case this do not occur,[7] the threatening of judgment. The remembrance[8] of the first better condition, whence as from a moral elevation the church had fallen,[9] should cause a penitential return and the doing of the first works, as they formerly gave testimony to that first love (ver. 4). In this line of thought, the *πόθεν πέπτωκας* cannot mean "the loss of salvation you have experienced."[10] The threat (*κιν. τ. λυχν., κ.τ.λ.*) is expressed, not only in accordance with the designation of the speaking Lord, ver. 1, but also (*ἐρχ. σοι*) in connection with the prophetic fundamental thoughts of the entire book, as both are inwardly combined with one another, as Christ is the one who is to come, according to his relation described in ver. 1[11] to his church (and the world). But since John states the particular judgment upon an individual congregation as a coming of the Lord, which yet is not identical with his final coming, the peculiar goal of all prophecy, the prophet himself shows how he associates the individual preliminary revelations of judgment with the full conclusion in the final judgment, as well as distinguishes them from one another.[12] But the distinction dare not be urged in such a way that the eschatological reference of the *ἔρχομαι* vanishes.[13] — Concerning the dat. incomm. *σοί*,[14] cf. Winer, p. 147. — *κ. κινήσω τ. λυχνίαν σου, κ.τ.λ.*, designates, according to the rule underlying the whole representation,[15] nothing else than: "I will cause thee to cease to be the church."[16] Ewald, unsatisfactorily: "I will withdraw my grace and kindness from thee." Grotius, incorrectly: "I will cause thy people to flee another way; viz., to those places where there will be greater

[1] Grot., Ewald. Cf. also Heinr. on ver. 5.
[2] Heinr., De Wette, Ebrard.
[3] Cf. Hos. ii. 15 sqq.
[4] Eph. v. 25, 32.
[5] Rev. xix. 9, xxii. 17.
[6] Ebrard.
[7] *εἰ δὲ μή*. Cf. Winer, p. 508: *ἐὰν μὴ μετανοήσῃς*, as once more made expressly prominent at the close. Cf. Winer, p. 568.
[8] *μνημον.*, iii. 3.
[9] Cf. also Rom. xi. 11, 22, xiv. 4; 1 Cor. x. 12; Heb. iv. 11. N. de Lyra, Pric., Eichh., Stern, De Wette, Hengstenb., etc.
[10] Kypke, Bretschneider, *Lex.* on this word, by presupposing the false reading *ἐκπέπτ.*, which, according to linguistic usage, more readily offers the conception of something lost.
[11] Cf. i. 12 sqq.
[12] Cf. also De Wette, etc.
[13] Against Klief.
[14] ii. 16. Cf. iii. 3, *ἐπὶ σὲ*.
[15] i. 12 sqq., 20. Cf. to *κιν.*, vi. 14.
[16] Aretius. Cf. Heinr., De Wette, Stern, Hengstenb., etc.

care for the poor."[1] Zeger, and many others who regard the angel as the bishop of the church, incorrectly: "I will take the church from thee, that thou no longer preside over it."

Ver. 6. Not for the purpose of alleviating the pain of the church concerning the reproof of ver. 4,[2] but because the Lord's love for his church gladly recognizes what is to be properly acknowledged, and once more, but in a new and more definite way, makes prominent in opposition to ver. 4 sqq. (ἀλλά) the one point of commendation already in ver. 2. Just because the church was rejected for no longer having the *first* love to their Lord, is it once more expressly acknowledged that it is still so far of one mind with him, as to hate the wicked works which he hates. Thus ver. 6 has enough that is peculiar, as not to appear a mere repetition of ver. 2, and contains no marks whatever whereby vv. 2, 3, are to be understood in the sense of Hengstenberg. — With τοῦτο ἔχ. neither ἀγαθόν, nor the like, is used to complete the construction: the explanation of the τοῦτο in ὅτι μισ., κ.τ.λ., shows that the common possession is commendable. — The μισεῖς is not "a strong expression for censuring,"[3] but is just as earnestly meant as the μισῶ.[4] But it is justly remarked already by N. de Lyra,[5] that the hatred is directed not against the persons, but against the works.[6] — Concerning the Nicolaitans,[7] as well concerning their name as also their conduct, it is possible to judge only by a comparison with ver. 14 sqq. Irenaeus,[8] Hippolyt.,[9] Tertullian,[10] Clemens Alex.,[11] Jerome,[12] Augustine,[13] and other Church Fathers derive the sect from a founder Nicolaus, and that, too, the deacon mentioned in Acts vi. 5, of whom they have more to relate as they are more remote from him in time. That this is derived entirely from this passage, and is of no more importance than that according to which the Ebionites are represented as springing from a certain Ebion,[14] is shown, *first*, from the fluctuation of the tradition which also knew how to defend that church officer, so highly commended in Acts, from the disgrace of having founded a troublesome sect,[15] and, *secondly*, from the circumstance that the patristic tradition, from the very beginning, refers to Rev. ii. 6, 14 sqq. Nicolaus of Acts vi. was thought of because none other of that name was known.[16] Since Chr. A. Heumann,[17] and J. W. Janus,[18] the opinion has become almost universal, that the designation Νικολαΐται (from νικᾶν and λαός) suggests the Hebrew name Balaam (from בָּלַע and עָם, i.e., swallowing-up, or destruction, of the people), whereby

[1] Cf. on ver. 4.
[2] Grot., Hengstenb.
[3] De Wette.
[4] Cf. on ver. 2.
[5] Cf. also Hengstenb., etc.
[6] Cf. ii. 14. Incorrectly, Calov.: "dogmas."
[7] Cf. Gieseler's *Kirchengeschichte*, i. 1, sec. 29; Winer, *Rwb.*; literature in Wolf.
[8] *Haer.*, i. 26.
[9] *Ref. Omn. Haer.*, ed. Gott., 1859, p. 408.
[10] *Praescr. Haer.*, 46.
[11] *Strom.*, ii. 20, p. 490; iii. 4, p. 522.
[12] Adv. Lucifer, 23.
[13] *Haer.*, 5.
[14] Cf. Tertullian, l. c. 33.
[15] Cf. Clemens Alex.
[16] Against Ebrard and Klief., who, as well as Grot., Calov., and the older and Catholic expositors in general, hold to the patristic statement.
[17] *Act. Erud. Ann.*, 1712, p. 179; *Poecile*, ii. 392.
[18] *De Nicol. ex Haeret. Catalogo Expungendis. Viteb.*, 1723. Cf. Vitr., Wetst., Eichh., Herder, Heinrichs, who, however, is inclined to affirm that there was at Ephesus a Nicolaus. Cf. also Ewald, Gesch., Jer., vii. 172 sqq., Züllig, Hengstenb., etc.

the Balaamite nature of those Nicolaitanes is to be indicated. To this vv. 14, 15, refer.[1] Yet it cannot be positively decided whether John found the word used already in this sense, or was himself the first to frame it. A comparison may be made with the name Armillus given to antichrist,[2] i.e., ἐρημόλαος.[3] — The Nicolaitans are of course not identical[4] with the κακοί mentioned in ver. 2, since the latter expression is very general: yet, at all events, they belong to "them which are evil;" and the idea, which in itself is highly improbable, must not be inferred,[5] that in vv. 2 and 6, two entirely different kinds of false teachers are meant, of whom the former may be regarded disciples of John,[6] or Jewish teachers,[7] or strict Jewish Christians,[8] while the Nicolaitans, who, according to De Wette, etc., are again distinct from Balaamites,[9] as those of a more heathen tendency, viz., false teachers who surrendered themselves[10] to a false freedom.[11] Tertullian and other Church fathers, N. de Lyra, and the older expositors, connect the Nicolaitans with the Gnostics; Hengstenb. also regards them identical with the deniers of the Son, in the Epistles of John, by referring the warning in John v. 21[12] to the ethnicizing ways of the false teachers there antagonized. But for all this, there is no foundation. What especially contradicts Hengstenberg's conjecture is the fact that the (Gnostic) false teachers of the Epistles of John are attacked just as decidedly because of their false doctrines, as the Nicolaitans of the Apoc. because of their evil deeds.[13] That the aberrations are practical, which even Hengstenb. emphasizes, but without ground alleges also of the false teachers in 1 John, is shown already by ver. 2 (κακούς). We shall therefore have to think of the Nicolaitans as ethnicizing libertines.[14] This is not contradicted by the fact that they assumed apostolic authority; for if they possibly professed to vindicate their Christian freedom in the Pauline sense, they might likewise wish to be apostles like Paul.[15] [See Note XXIX., p. 155.]

Ver. 7. ὁ ἔχων οὖς ἀκουσάτω, κ.τ.λ. Formula for exciting attention.[16] The singular οὖς by no means points, in distinction from the plural,[17] to "the spiritual sense of understanding,"[18] but designates with entire simplicity the organ of hearing without respect to its being double. In like manner, in Luke xi. 34. The reference made in the summons is altogether general;[19] even to those who still are outside the churches, belongs what is said to the churches, because the entire book of Revelation, no less than the seven epistles which form an entire part thereof, proclaims the coming of the Lord as something final to the whole world. John himself, as a true prophet,

[1] Cf., on the other hand, De Wette.
[2] Cf. Commentary on 1 John ii. 18.
[3] K. Wieseler, *Chronol. d. apost. Zeitalt.*, p. 263 sqq.
[4] Hengstenb.
[5] Ewald.
[6] Eichh.
[7] Züll.
[8] Ewald.
[9] See on vv. 14 and 15.
[10] Ewald.
[11] Cf. ver. 14 with Acts xv. 29.
[12] Which, however, is not "directed against heathenism clothed in a Christian garb."
[13] Cf. vv. 14, 20.
[14] Cf. also A. Ritschl, *Entst. d. Altkath. K.* Bonn, 1857, p. 134 sq.
[15] According to Volkm., the strict Judæo-Christian author of the Apoc. had in mind the Apostle to the Gentiles and his adherents. Cf. also Hilgenfeld, *Kanon*, p. 223. Cf. Introduction, sec. 2, note.
[16] Grotius.
[17] Cf. vv. 11, 17, 29, iii. 6, 13, 22, xiii. 9.
[18] Hengstenb.
[19] Cf. xxii. 17.

makes prominent the universal reference of his prophecy.[1] — τὸ πνεῦμα is neither this "divine vision,"[2] nor Christ who has the Spirit,[3] but the Holy Ghost,[4] who inspires John, and thus makes him a prophet.[5] The revelation of Christ[6] can therefore be designated also as an address of the Spirit, because the Spirit is the Spirit of Christ,[7] and speaks in Christ's name.[8] Yet this is conceivable only if we regard[9] neither the seven epistles as merely a dictation of Christ, which John had only to write down, nor the entire book of Revelation as a mere report prepared by John of a series of pictures represented to him; but rather recognize the specific prophetic activity whereby he, as a man taught of Christ himself through his Spirit, thought and wrote not under a suppression, but a glorification, of his entire moral individuality. — The promise belongs, in its universality, to the victors; as the preceding summons to hear, to every one who has an ear. The hearer is through the prophecy to learn to be victor, and thus to be saved.[10] νικῶν,[11] as well as δίκαιος,[12] is impossible. According to iii. 21[13] and xii. 11,[14] the νικᾶν at the close of all seven epistles[15] designates nothing else than the faithful perseverance of believers, as maintained in the struggle with all godless and antichristian powers. So, also, the sacred reward of blessedness is promised the "victor," who is represented in many forms, abiding faithful to him patiently and to the end, maintaining and adhering to the words and commands of the Lord, etc. Cf. especially the concluding promises of the epistles, with the descriptions in chs. xix., xxi., xxii. — The δώσω αὐτῷ with the inf. φαγεῖν has a somewhat different meaning from when (as, e.g., vv. 17, 28) a definite object follows: it means, "I will grant him to eat;"[16] not, "I will give him to eat." — The ξύλον τῆς ζωῆς, κ.τ.λ., is not the gospel whose fruit is blessedness,[17] nor the Holy Ghost who assures of eternal life,[18] nor Christ himself whose fruits are all spiritual blessings,[19] and who in the holy supper gives his flesh to be eaten;[20] but the antitype of the tree of life that was in the midst of the original earthly paradise,[21] the tree of life which is to refresh the blessed citizens of the new Jerusalem.[22] In accordance with Gen. ii. 3, as also this passage, the place of blessedness where the tree of life is to be found is called *paradise*.[23] The addition τοῦ θεοῦ μου is not without meaning, since God is the Lord of paradise, the one from whom the new Jerusalem descends, who will dwell with men, from whose throne and that of the Lamb proceeds life,[24] upon communion with whom, therefore, the future bless-

[1] Cf. i. 3. [2] Grot.
[3] Eichh. Cf. also Heinr.
[4] Cf. i. 4.
[5] i. 10, xix. 10.
[6] vv. 1-6. Cf., likewise, σώσω.
[7] Rom. viii. 9, 10.
[8] John xvi. 13 sqq.
[9] Cf. Intr., sec. 2.
[10] i. 3, xxii. 14.
[11] It should properly be explained, "He who gains his case in court."
[12] Eichh. Cf. also Heinr.
[13] Where it is also absolutely said of Christ as the head of believers.
[14] Where an object is mentioned, as in 1 John ii. 13, v. 4, 5; John xvi. 33.
[15] Cf. xxi. 7.
[16] Cf. iii. 21; John v. 26. De Wette.
[17] Aret.
[18] Grot.
[19] Calov., Ebrard. Cf. Victorin, Beda, Lyra.
[20] John vi. 54. Alcasar.
[21] Cf. Gen. ii. 9, where the LXX., as frequently elsewhere, render פַּרְדֵּס by ξύλον.
[22] xxii. 2, 14, 19. Beng., Ew., De Wette, Hengstenb.
[23] Cf. Luke xxiii. 43; 2 Cor. xii. 4.
[24] Cf. xxi. 2, 3, xxii. 1.

edness and glory of believers depend. Besides, the mediatorship of Christ is intimated by *τ. θ. μου*, since Christ who himself rewards the victor (*δώσω*), and himself sits with God upon the throne, in whom is the source of life, nevertheless speaks of his God and the God of believers;[1] both being in accordance with the indivisible fundamental view of the entire N. T., that Christ through his obedience is exalted, through his conflict has conquered, and through his sufferings has entered into the glory which was his own from eternity, and whereof he now makes his believers partakers, since he as Priest, King, and Victor makes them priests, kings, and victors.[2] As to the Apocalyptic statement of the thought, ver. 7*b*, cf. the Book of Enoch, xxxi. 1–5, xxiv. 1–11; Text. XII. Patr., p. 586; Schöttgen on this passage.

Vv. 8–11. The epistle to the church at Smyrna. — Smyrna, eight geographical miles north of Ephesus, on a bay of the Aegean Sea, and the river Meles, was already in ancient times, as it is to the present, an important place of business. After Old Smyrna had been destroyed by the Lydians, New Smyrna, twenty stadia from the old place, was built, according to Pausanias by Alexander the Great, according to Strabo by Antigonus, and afterwards by Lysimachus, — a very beautiful city.[3] — Of Christian life at Smyrna we have, except in the Apoc., the earliest statement in the Epistle of Ignatius,[4] at the beginning of the second century. At that time Polycarp was bishop of Smyrna,[5] of whose martyrdom in the year 168 the church of Smyrna itself has made the record.[6] Many, especially the Catholic expositors,[7] regard Polycarp the angel of the church[8] mentioned in this epistle; which, however, is in a chronological respect untenable, even if it should be admitted that the Apoc. was composed under Domitian, although Polycarp "had served Christ" for eighty-six years.[9]

Ver. 8. The self-designation of the Lord[10] corresponds to the admonition and promise, vv. 10 and 11. — *ἔζησεν* contains by its combination with *ἐγεν. νεκρός* the intimation that the life is a new one succeeding a victory over death.[11] The aor. *ἔζησεν*[12] marks the historical fact of the resurrection, as the precise fact of death is designated by *ἐγεν. νεκρ.*; cf. the aor. i. 5, iii. 9. An analogy is furnished by Josephus, *Life*, 75: "Of the three crucified who were taken down, two died notwithstanding the care: *ὁ δὲ τρίτος ἔζησεν*" (the third lived).

Ver. 9. *τ. θλῖψιν*. Altogether general.[13] To this, affliction, imprisonment, and death (ver. 10), disgrace and need, belong. If it be possible for the

[1] John xx. 17.

[2] i. 6, iii. 21. Cf. Phil. ii. 6 sqq.; John xvii. 24.

[3] Cf. Wetst., Winer, *Rwb.*

[4] *Ep. ad Smyrn., ad Polycarp.*

[5] Cf. Irenaeus in Euseb., *H. E.*, iv. 14: "Πολυκ. — *ὑπὸ ἀποστόλων κατασταθεὶς εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν ἐν τῇ ἐν Σμύρνῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐπίσκοπος*" ("Polycarp — appointed bishop by the apostles in Asia, in the church at Smyrna"). Cf. iii. 36. Tertullian, *Praeser. Haer.*, 32: "It is reported that Polycarp was placed, by John, in the church of the Smyrnæans."

[6] *Martyrium S. Polyc. in den Edd. der apostol. Väter.* Cf. Euseb., *H. E.*, iv. 15.

[7] N. de Lyra, Ribera, Alcas., C. a Lap., Tirni., Stern, Calov., Hengstenb., etc.

[8] i.e., bishop. Cf., to the contrary, on i. 20.

[9] *Martyr.*, c. 9.

[10] i. 17 sqq. Cf. i. 15.

[11] xiii. 14, x. 45. Cf. Ezek. xxxvii. 3; Matt. ix. 16; John v. 25.

[12] Cf., on the other hand, the *ζῶν εἰμι, κ.τ.λ.*, i. 18.

[13] Cf. i. 9.

πτωχεία to be connected with the θλῖψις, and to originate from the fact that Christians were despoiled of their property,[1] yet, also,[2] that on account of their poverty the Christians were utterly helpless when their Jewish enemies possibly supported their calumnious charges before the heathen rulers with money;[3] yet this inner connection of θλῖψις, πτωχεία, and βλασφημία is in no way indicated, and the simple admission is sufficient, that, besides the troubles occasioned by Jews and heathen, the Church was under the burden of poverty. To this it is immediately added parenthetically, in a consolatory antithesis: ἀλλὰ πλούσιος εἰ, viz., in spiritual goods or in God.[4] To endeavor to find here an allusion to the name Polycarp[5] (rich in fruit), is arbitrary. In what the βλασφημία which Christians had to suffer consisted, can only be conjectured with any certainty if the λέγοντες Ἰουδαίους εἶναι ἑαυτούς,[6] from whom they went forth,[7] are regarded not as Christians[8] but as actual Jews; which the wording and the historical relations, as they were still at the time of the apologists, support. The carnal pride of the Jews, and their godless zeal for the law,[9] were already, at the time of Paul, the cause of their unbelief, and hostility to Christians which they published in false and calumnious charges, among which was the one brought of old,[10] viz., of exciting seditions, which generally had the greater weight with the heathen,[11] as this occurred at a time in which the Roman rulers, because of the war in Judaea, had to be doubly watchful and suspicious in all places.[12] Even the martyrdom of Polycarp occurred with the essential participation of the Jews.[13] — As, to the proud claim of those who boasted of the theocratic name of Jews, the judgment is added that they are not,[14] so also what is positively said concerning their true nature, ἀλλὰ συναγωγὴ τοῦ σατανᾶ, contains a sharp opposition to the claim of being the συναγωγὴ κυρίου[15] which essentially concurs with the former boast. But they are rather the synagogue of Satan, because they do the antichristian works of Satan,[16] to which also belongs the βλασφημεῖν with its lies and hatred.[17] The expression συναγωγή, which in the N. T. only once in James[18] designates the Christian congregational assembly, — yet even there is combined not with τοῦ θεοῦ, etc., but with ὑμῶν, — has in itself a significative antithesis to the true ἐκκλησία τ. θεοῦ or τ. κυρίου. We can scarcely suppose that John could have changed the expression ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ, which was a fixed designation for the Christian Church, as it is used even of the O. T. people of God, into ἐκκλησία τοῦ σατανᾶ.[19] There is an allusion of similar severity in Hosea,[20] when he writes בֵּית אָוֶן instead of בֵּית־אֵל.

Ver. 10. In reference to the θλῖψις which is to follow the present (ver. 9), an exhortation to fearless, faithful perseverance unto death, and a corre-

[1] Heb. x. 34. Primas, Beda, C. a Lap., Tirni, De Wette.
[2] Hengstenb.
[3] Cf. Jas. ii. 5 sqq. Hengstenb.
[4] Cf. iii. 18; Matt. vi. 20; Luke xii. 21; 1 Cor. i. 5; 2 Cor. vi. 10.
[5] Hengstenb. [6] Cf. on ver. 2.
[7] ἐκ. Winer, p. 344.
[8] Vitr., etc.
[9] Cf. Rom. ii. 28; Matt. iii. 9; John viii. 33; 2 Cor. xi. 22; Phil. iii. 4 sqq.
[10] Luke xxiii. 2.
[11] Cf. Acts xvii. 6 sqq.
[12] Against Hengstenb.
[13] Martyr., c. 12, 13.
[14] Cf. iii. 9.
[15] Num. xvi. 3, xx. iv., xxxi. 16.
[16] Cf. ver. 10.
[17] John viii. 41 sqq.
[18] ii. 2.
[19] Cf. Trench, *Synonymes of the N. T.*, § 3.
[20] iv. 15.

sponding promise of life, are made. Troubles of many kinds (ἃ plural) impend; especially mentioned is imprisonment[1] for some of the church,[2] — the chief thing in all the persecutions in which the civil authorities were active,[3] — and a view of the same is disclosed, even unto death for Christ's sake.[4] The mention of imprisonment shows, still more than that of death, that the assault of heathen magistrates who, according to ver. 9, were incited by the Jews, is here contemplated. The Lord therefore comprises both forms of antichrist. As the proper author of the afflictions, ὁ διάβολος is therefore mentioned,[5] the personal first enemy of Christ and his kingdom,[6] who uses Jews and heathen as his instruments. The significance of the name (slanderer) is not here to be emphasized:[7] otherwise we should expect in ver. 9 ὁ διαβ., and in ver. 10 ὁ σατ. — ἵνα πειρασθῆτε καὶ ἔχητε, κ.τ.λ. Both the temptation and the oppression[8] belong to the intention of the Devil. Thus the πειρασμός appears not as a divine trial,[9] but[10] as a temptation intended on Satan's part for their ruin,[11] in connection with which, of course, it must be firmly maintained,[12] that the Devil's power is exercised only under the Divine control.[13] Under this presumption, to the καὶ ἔχητε θλῖψιν, which as the πειρασθῆτε is entirely dependent on ἵνα, the ἡμερῶν δέκα is added. For the Lord fixes a limit of duration to the troubles which are to come upon his believers.[14] Only a few expositors have understood the ἡμερ. δέκα of ten actual days,[15] but even these in the sense that the short period of the calamity is intended as a consolation. But the number is purely of a schematic nature,[16] and signifies not a long[17] but a short time.[18] [See Note XXX., p. 156.] The entire period of the universal tribulation is schematically represented by forty-two months.[19] The chief misinterpretations are known already by N. de Lyra: that the ten days are ten years, in which are reckoned the persecution under Domitian[20] and that under Decius;[21] that the ten persecutions of Christians are meant;[22] that the ten days correspond to and signify the Ten Commandments, and that the persecution of the entire Church will continue as long as the Ten Commandments are in force, i.e., until the end of the world, etc. — Without any external combination, the admonition

[1] Incorrectly, Heinr.: φυλ., as a part for the whole, designates misery of every kind.

[2] ἐξ ὑμῶν, Winer, p. 343.

[3] Acts xii. 3, xvi. 23. Ew.

[4] ἄχρι θανάτου, xii. 11; Acts xxii. 4; Phil. ii. 8; Heb. xii. 4. N. de Lyra, Calov., Heinr., Ew., De Wette, Hengstenb., Ebrard.

[5] Cf. ver. 9: συναγ. τ. σατανᾶ.

[6] Chs. xii. and xiii.

[7] Against Züll. and Hengstenb.

[8] See Critical Remarks on the modified var. ἔξετε. According to this, the latter was proclaimed as, in general, only impending.

[9] "They may be tried in order, that, amidst the greatest dangers, their faith may be tested, and thus they may show their virtue to be complete" (Ew.). Cf. also Grot., Bleek, De Wette.

[10] Cf. Eichh., Heinr.

[11] In which the Lord preserves and delivers, iii. 10. Cf. Luke xxii. 31.

[12] Cf. Beng., Hengstenb.

[13] Matt. iv. 1.

[14] Cf. Matt. xxix. 22.

[15] Grot., Herder.

[16] Klief: "The number of systematic completeness."

[17] Beda, C. a Lap., etc., according to Job xix. 3; Num. xiv. 22; 1 Sam. i. 8.

[18] Andr., Alcas., Calov., Heinr., Ew., De Wette. Cf. also Hengstenb., Stern; Gen. xxiv. 55; Dan. i. 12 sqq.; Num. xi. 19.

[19] xiii. 5.

[20] Cluverus, in Calov.

[21] Vitr.

[22] As Ebrard infers by regarding the ten days as "a symbol of ten special sections or periods in the persecution."

γίνου πιστός follows, which in the limitation ἄχρι θαν. reaches farther than has been thus far represented by the θλῖψις. With reference to the still future maintenance of fidelity, the γίνου and not ἴσθι properly stands.[1] — The promise, having its pledge in the Lord's own life after death (ver. 8), has essentially no other meaning than that which is given the victor in ver. 11, as the victory is won only by fidelity unto death. — The καὶ which introduces the promise places it in connection with the preceding requirement.[2] — τ. στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς. Appositive genitive,[3] so that life itself appears as the crown.[4] The expression στέφανος does not mean here the crown of a king, neither in the sense that the coming kingdom of the faithful is indicated,[5] nor in this, that the king's crown designates in general only "something exceedingly precious and glorious;"[6] but the figure of the victor's crown[7] is derived from the games, and in the mouth of the author of the Apocalypse, as well as of the Apostle Paul,[8] is open to no objection whatever.[9]

Ver. 11. The promise, which, in addition to the general command to hear,[10] is contained in the concluding verse, is framed in accordance with what precedes.[11] The victory recalls the struggle with the afflictions of persecution,[12] through which there has been a victorious battle in their fidelity unto death.[13] The victorious warrior reaches peace before the throne of God and the Lamb,[14] or, as here said in reference to ver. 10,[15] "He shall not be hurt of the second death." On οὐ μή, cf. Winer, p. 471. — ἀδικηθῇ as vi. 6, vii. 2, 3, and often Luke x. 19. ἐκ, causal, as viii. 11.[16] — The *second death* designates eternal damnation in hell,[17] eternal after temporal death. The expression is derived from Jewish theology,[18] but is pervaded with a meaning specifically Christian, since they incur the second death, who have no part in the marriage of the Lamb, and therefore are outside of Christ.[19] [See Note XXXI., p. 156.]

Vv. 12–17. The epistle to the church at Pergamos. — Pergamos or Pergamum in Mysia, on the river Caïcus, not to be confounded with ancient Troy or Pergamum considerably distant to the north,[20] was distinguished for the temple of Aesculapius, which was regarded as an asylum,[21] and much visited not only because of its worship, but also because of *incubationes*[22] and dream-cures,[23] vying in glory with the temple of Diana at Ephesus, and the

[1] Matt. x. 16; xxiv. 44; Luke xii. 40.

[2] Luke xi. 9; Eph. v. 14; Jas. iv. 7. Cf. De Wette, Winer, p. 406.

[3] Winer, p. 494 sqq.

[4] Jas. i. 12; 1 Pet. v. 4. De Wette, Hengstenb., etc.

[5] Züll.

[6] Hengstenb., according to Isa. lxii. 3, xxviii, 3.

[7] Cf. ver. 11.

[8] 2 Tim. ii. 5, iv. 7 sqq.; 1 Cor. ix. 24; Phil. iii. 14.

[9] Against Hengstenb.

[10] Cf. ver. 7.

[11] Cf. vv. 10, 8.

[12] Cf. John xvi. 33.

[13] 2 Tim. iv. 7.

[14] vii. 9 sqq.

[15] ἄχρι θανάτου. Cf. Matt. x. 28.

[16] Winer, p. 344.

[17] xx. 6, 14, xxi. 8.

[18] *Targ.* on Ps. xlix. 11: "The wicked who die the second death, and are consigned to Gehenna." *Targum of Jerusalem*, on Deut. xxxiii. 6. Cf. Wetst.

[19] Chs. xx., xxi.

[20] Against C. a Lap., Tlr.

[21] Tacitus, *Annal.*, iii. 63.

[22] [The spending of nights in the temple of Aesculapius as an act of gratitude for some deliverance. Smith's *Dictionary Greek and Roman Antiquities*, p. 376b.]

[23] Herodian, *Hist.*, iv. 8. Cf. K. F. Hermann, *Lehrbuch d. gottesdienstl. Alterth. d. Griechen*, Heidelb., 1846, § 41.

sanctuary of Apollo at Delphi,[1] as well as for its library. By the will of the last and childless King Attalus, this rich place[2] fell to the Romans. According to Pliny,[3] Pergamos was the seat of a Roman supreme court. The present Bergamo contains many relics of the ancient city. The earliest record of the Christian church at Pergamos is this in the Apoc. In conformity with ver. 13, Tertullian[4] speaks of Antipas the martyr. Eusebius,[5] after having treated of Polycarp of Smyrna, makes mention of the martyrs in Pergamos, Carpus, Papylus, and Agathonice. The "*doctores*" mentioned by N. de Lyra held Carpus to be the bishop to whom John wrote. Others call the bishop of Thyatira by that name.[6]

Ver. 12. The designation of Christ[7] looks forward to the threat, ver. 16.

Ver. 13. The *ποῦ κατοικ.* is immediately afterwards described more accurately: *ὅπου ὁ θρ. τ. σατ.* This in itself does not contain a commendation, but serves as a commendation only as the church remains faithful although dwelling where Satan's seat is, which is communicated by the more emphatic and explicit repetition at the close of *ὅπου ὁ σατ. κατοικεῖ*.[8] It is a matter of importance, however, that the Lord first of all simply testifies, for its consolation, to his knowledge of the nature of his church's abode: *ὅπου ὁ θρόνος τοῦ σατανᾶ*. At all events, this[9] points to the city of Pergamos as the place of the church; and hence the explanation is incorrect, according to which the godless enemies of Christ and his believers are represented[10] as Satan's throne.[11] There is nothing to support the opinion[12] that Satan's throne was in Pergamos as the chief abode of the worship of Aesculapius, whose symbol was the serpent; for if, on account of his serpent, John would have desired to designate Aesculapius directly as the Devil[13] (which would have been inappropriate, as, according to 1 Cor. x. 20, that particular *εἰδωλον* can be only one *δαιμόνιον* among many), he would at least have indicated it by *ὁ θρ. τοῦ δράκοντος*. We must first, with Andreas,[14] think of a remarkable flourishing of idol-worship in general, if the remark of And. that Perg. was *κατείδωλος ὑπὲρ τὴν Ἀσίαν πᾶσαν* (given to idolatry above all Asia) would have an historical foundation. That Perg. is called the seat of Satan as the abode of heathen and Nicolaitans,[15] is partly too general, and partly contrary to the meaning of ver. 14. The only correct view is the reference, understood already by N. de Lyra, to the persecution of the church, ascribed also in ver. 10 to the Devil;[16] decidedly in favor of this explanation is the *ὅπου ὁ σατ. κατοικεῖ* in its connection with *ἀπεκτάνθη παρ' ὑμῖν*. Only in Perg. had Satan

[1] Cf. Wetst.

[2] Hor., I., *Od.* i. 12; II., *Od.* xviii. 5.

[3] *H. N.*, v. 33: "Pergamos, by far the most renowned of Asia. — The jurisdiction of that district is called Pergamean. To it belong the inhabitants of Thyatira, and other less honored states."

[4] *Adv. Gnost. scorp.*, 12.

[5] *H. E.*, iv. 15.

[6] Ver. 18. Cf. Alcas., C. a Lap.

[7] Cf. i. 16.

[8] Thus with regard to *κατοικεῖς*.

[9] Cf. the *ποῦ κατοικεῖς* and *ὅπου ὁ σατ. κατοικεῖ*.

[10] Primas, Zeger.

[11] The opinion of P. Zornius (in Wolf) is a curiosity; viz., that John had in view the Pergamean museum, and the empty speeches of the sophists.

[12] Grot., Wetst., M. Rossal and Ph. Hasäus in the *Bibl. Brem.*, iii. pp. 94, 104. Cf. also Eichh., Heinr.

[13] xii. 3, 9.

[14] Aret., Pric., Beng., etc.

[15] C. a Lap., Calov.

[16] Ew., De Wette, Hengstenb., Ebrard.

been able to proceed so far as to shed the blood of martyrs. Whether this was caused by the adherence of the heathen with special fanaticism to their Aesculapius;[1] or the fact that Perg., as the seat of supreme jurisdiction,[2] most readily offered a theatre for persecutions;[3] or, finally, that only particularly hostile individuals[4] to be sought among the heathen, because not further designated,[5] were present in Perg.,—it is not possible to decide. — *καὶ κρατεῖς, κ.τ.λ.* The holding fast[6] of Christ's name, which continues still to the present (*κρατεῖς*, pres.), has already approved itself on some special opportunity (*καὶ οὐκ ἠρνήσω*, aor.). As the *κρατεῖς* corresponds to the contrasted *ἠρνήσω*, so *τὸ ὄνομα μου* is parallel with *τὴν πίστιν μου*. The former is the objective, and the latter the subjective nature. Christ's *ὄνομα* which is held fast by believers is not "the profession of doctrine delivered by Christ"[7] or the confession of his name,[8] but the name of Christ appears as something in itself objective, so that one may have, hold, and lose, confess and deny it, yea, even, it may work,[9] as the name of Christ comprises the true objective person of Christ together with his riches and glory. The *κρατεῖν τὸ ὄνομα* occurs in the sense of this passage, of course, only by faithful, frank confession, but not simply "in life and faith."[10] The corresponding inner item (Rom. x. 10) is faith in the Lord: *τ. πίστ. μου*, objective genitive.[11] — *καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἀντίπας, κ.τ.λ.* The correct text, with which the Vulg. in the critical recension agrees,[12] i.e., in which before *Ἀντίπας* neither *αἷς* nor *ἐν αἷς* nor *ἐμαῖς* is to be read, but on the contrary before *ἀπεκτ.* there is a *ὃς*,[13] is not explicable by the conjecture that the gen. *Ἀντίπα* may have stood originally in the text,[14] nor by the idea that *Ἀντίπας* is used as indeclinable, and the form here is intended as genitive;[15] for both conjectures, in themselves having little probability, are made doubly difficult by the nominative appos. *ὁ μαρτ. ὁ πιστ.*, since here it is hard to accept the explanation which is in place in i. 5, where what is said, is of Christ himself. Grotius assumes an ellipsis and a transposition by thus analyzing the sentence: *ἐν τ. ἡμ. Ἀντίπα, ὃς Ἀντίπας — ἀπεκτάνθη*. Ebrard, who, however, reads *αἷς* before *Ἀντ.*, explains the anacoluthon in the sentence by the supposition that the originally intended construction *αἷς Ἀντίπας — ἀπεκτάνθη* was abandoned, because the chief verb *ἀπεκτ.* is added as an explanation of the words *ὁ μαρτ. μ. ὁ πιστ.*, and thus a relative sentence originated which contains the verb properly belonging to *Ἀντίπας*. But even the latter explanation does not naturally appear in the simple members of which the entire sentence consists. Primas,

[1] In connection with which, we must remember that the idol, because of its epithet *σωτήρ*, formed a manifest opposition to the Saviour; we may also think of miraculous cures in the temple of Aesc., and the interests connected therewith. Cf. Acts xix. 24 sqq., xvi. 19 sqq.

[2] Kliefoth.

[3] In connection with which, relations acknowledged in Plin., *Ep.* 97, and the apologists, and even indicated in Acts, may be recalled.

[4] Hengstenb.

[5] Ewald.

[6] Cf. ver. 1, iii. 11.

[7] Grot.

[8] De Wette.

[9] Cf. Acts ii. 21, iii. 16, ix. 14; John i. 12.

[10] N. de Lyra.

[11] xiv. 12; Rom. iii. 22; Eph. iii. 12. Winer, p. 175.

[12] "Et in diebus Antipas, testis meus fidelis, qui occisus est," etc. Lach., Tisch.

[13] See Critical Remarks.

[14] Ewald.

[15] Bleek.

N. de Lyra, C. a Lap., and other catholic expositors,[1] have correctly hit the sense by following the explanatory reading of the Vulg. "in diebus *illis*," for if also the mere article cannot have directly the force of a demonstrative, yet it marks the precise days in which the church did not deny the faith: "*and in the day Antipas*" (namely: was) "*my faithful witness who*," etc. It is designedly that the commendation of the church is still further enhanced by the circumstance especially added (*καί*), that one witness, in the days when the whole church faithfully gave its testimony, was faithful even unto death. The reference to the *οὐκ ἠρνήσω τ. πίστιν μου* is indicated also by the expression *ὁ μαρτ. μου ὁ πίστος*,[2] as then also the *παρ' ὑμῖν* and the repeated *ὅπου ὁ σατ. κατοικεῖ* in this connection are significant. — Of the martyr Antipas, nothing historical is known. Whether his martyrdom, noticed by Andreas, were related already perhaps from the account, contained in the later martyrologies and menologies, viz., that Antipas as bishop of Pergamos under Domitian was put to death in a glowing brazen ox, we do not know. The interpretations of the name as Ἀντι-πᾶς, i.e., "Against all," therefore, child of God, and hence enemy of the whole world,[3] or Anti-papa,[4] are wrecked by grammar, which teaches that Ἀντίπας is similar to Ἀντίπατρος.[5] Coccejus, for this reason, wants to find in Antipas the confessor of Athanasianism, since Ἀντίπατρος resembles *ἰσόπατρος*, and this again *ὁμοούσιος*. Vitringa adds, yet, that the mystical Pergamos where this mystical Antipas was slain, viz., again mystically, by banishment, or, in general, by hinderance of confession, is Alexandria, the residence of Athanasius.

Vv. 14, 15. The reproof contrasted with the commendation[6] refers to a few things: *ὀλίγα*. Hence the plural occurs not because the tolerance of the false teachers is conceived "as more than *one* want,"[7] but, without noting the idea of plurality as such, designates in a certain abstract way only the general conception "a few."[8] What follows shows that actually only one particular thing is meant[9] The subject of the reproof, moreover, is designated as *small*, not by *litotes*,[10] also not with respect to atonement,[11] but because the church itself was not so much involved in the false doctrines, as, on the contrary, only certain adherents of the same are enumerated among its members.[12] The *ἔχεις* — not precisely equivalent to *ἀνέχεις*, "thou bearest"[13] — contains, in accordance with the connection, the additional idea, that the unaffected part, properly the heart of the church,[14] may have been slothful in efforts to reclaim the erring;[15] at all events, the church as such[16] is regarded as a whole, and hence is made responsible for containing within it the Nicolaitan false teachers, for this may always be referred to a defect of its

[1] Cf. also Treg.
[2] Beng.
[3] Aretius, Hengstenb., who understand thereby Timothy.
[4] Ed. Schmidt.
[5] Winer, p. 97.
[6] Cf. ver. 4.
[7] Bengel, who therefore fixes a certain distinction between Balaamites and Nicolaitans.
[8] Not "a little." Luther, Hengstenb
[9] Cf. Winer, p. 166.
[10] Heinr.: "I complain grievously of thee." Ebrard.
[11] Aret.: "Christ readily extenuates their sins, because, at the same time, he makes expiation for them;" but, in fact, the *ὀλίγα* are atrocious.
[12] Cf. De Wette.
[13] Heinr.
[14] De Wette.
[15] Cf. Calov., Vitr., Beng., Hengstenb.
[16] The angel of the church. Cf. i. 20.

nature with respect to the critical life of faith. Hence the call to repentance is made to the church as a whole, even though the conflict with the Lord coming to judgment pertains only to the false teachers (ver. 16). The ἐκεῖ stands in inner relation with ver. 13, as also the designation of the false teachers (κρατοῦντας τ. διδ. βαλ., ver. 14, and κρατοῦντας τ. διδ. Νικ., ver. 15) forms an antithesis to the commendation of the church, κρατεῖς τ. ὀν μου, ver. 13. Even in a place where a church has held fast to the name of the Lord even unto death, is there to be room at least for such godless doctrines. — τῷ βαλάκ. Luther incorrectly according to the Var., ἐν τῷ B., "*through* Balak." Nor is the dative to be regarded a *dat. comm.*, "to please B.," "in the interest of B.," so that it could result only from the connection that "the people of Balak" were strictly the women of Moab[1] whom especially Balaam had taught to lead astray the Israelites.[2] Here no appeal dare be made to the fact that in ver. 20 the acc. is construed regularly with διδάσκειν, for there the use of the acc. is conditioned also by the πλανᾷ. The dat. with διδάσκειν is Hebraizing.[3] The entire construction is like that of, e.g., ver. 7, where first the dat. and then the inf. follows the δώσω. On the other hand, a *dat. comm.* in the above sense seems too refined for the writer of the Apoc. Besides, it can in no way be inferred from the construction in Num. xxxi. 16, that Balaam immediately perverted the Moabite women: he may have given the advice referred to for leading the children of Israel astray, by means of Balak, whom he immediately taught. — τὴν διδαχὴν βαλ. The expression διδαχὴ is not to be explained simply from the counterpart, the διδαχὴ Νικ., since with the Nicolaitans an actual doctrine was the fundamental principle, which with Balaam was only an advice,[4] but has its justification in the succeeding ὃς ἐδίδασκεν. The doctrine communicated to Balak is first condemned according to its ungodly and corrupt nature: βαλεῖν σκάνδαλον ἐνώπιον τ. υ. Ἰσρ., then is stated according to its contents, so far as it refers to the present Nicolaitans: φαγ. εἰδωλ. κ. πορν. The instruction of Balaam contained a σκάνδαλον[5] because the Israelites were thereby led to a sin against their God,[6] viz., to participation in the idol-worship of Baal Peor and to fornication. In Num. xxv. 1 sqq., mention is made not only of the eating of the sacrifices made to idols, but also of the making of sacrifices. But here Christ regarded it sufficient to state what the Israelites had in common with the Nicolaitans.[7] οὕτως ἔχεις καὶ σύ, κ.τ.λ. "Just as Balak held the pestiferous doctrine of Balaam, so among you there are some holding the erroneous doctrine of Nicolaus." Thus N. de Lyra with substantial correctness explains the οὕτ. καὶ σύ, while he errs only by[8] combining the ὁμοίως at the close of ver. 15, referring back to what precedes, with μετανόησον, ver. 16, as if the church at Perg. were called to repentance like the church at Ephesus (ver. 5). But this reference is almost still more unnatural than that proposed by De

[1] Num. xxxi. 16.

[2] Hengstenb., following Beng.

[3] Cf. לְמֹד ל, Job xxi. 22. Ew., De Wette, Ebrard.

[4] De Wette.

[5] I.e., properly σκανδάληθρον, i.e., the trendle in a trap, מוֹקֵשׁ. Cf. Jer. vi. 21; Ezek. xiv. 3; Rom. xiv. 13. See my Commentary on 1 John ii. 10.

[6] מַעַל בַּיהוָה, Num. xxxi. 16.

[7] Grot.

[8] Cf. C. a Lap., Beng., Tirin., etc.

Wette,[1] according to which the καὶ σύ is used by way of comparison with Ephesus, ver. 6, and thereby a clear distinction is to be indicated between Balaamites and Nicolaitans, both of whom are considered as being in Perg. But by ὄντως — ὁμοίως is the Nicolaitan misconduct, consisting in φαγεῖν εἰδωλ. and πορνεῦσαι,[2] compared with the type of Balaamite sins, while the καὶ σύ in this line of thought either points back to Balak,[3] or, as is more probable, refers for its meaning to the ancient church of the children of Israel. As then there were in Israel many who sinned after the doctrine of Balaam, so thou hast likewise Nicolaitan offenders. But it in no way follows, that, because the name Nicolaitan recalls symbolically the meaning of Balaam's name,[4] therefore also the φαγ. εἰδωλ. and πορν. are to be understood, in some way figuratively and improperly,[5] of gluttons and voluptuaries whose belly is their god,[6] or of the visions and false teachers in general;[7] but rather as in the times of Balaam, participation in idol-worship and fornication actually occurred, so with respect to the so-called Nicolaitans the eating of sacrifices to idols, and fornication, are seriously meant; and the very circumstance that both things also named elsewhere in apostolic times[8] are here reproved with a passing-by of the proper idol-worship mentioned in Num. xxv. 1 sqq., indicates that these were actually the wicked works of the Nicolaitans[9] with respect to which they might have pleaded their Christian freedom.[10] [See Note XXXII., p. 156.]

Ver. 16. The summons to repentance, and the threat in case this is neglected, is added to the reproof, vv. 14, 15, as in ver. 5. As to the ἔρχομαί σοι, see on the former passage, and with respect to the ταχύ, cf. i. 1. The church as a whole, to whose members the Nicolaitans belong, having shared in the reproof, so also share in the admonition to repentance and the threat; for the conflict of the coming Lord, which is of course immediately directed only against the Nicolaitans (πολ. μετ' αὐτῶν), must cause suffering to the entire body of the church (ἔρχ. σοι). It will nevertheless be a judging and visible coming to the entire church, if it continue to neglect the deliverance of its still curable members, and to cut off those actually dead already. It is against the idea of the coming of the Lord in general, and against the significance of the image of the sword in the mouth of the Lord in particular,[11] if the πολεμήσω, κ.τ.λ., be explained: "I will raise up prophets in the church to do what the bishop neglects, and to courageously oppose themselves to the Nicolaitans,"[12] or be supplemented "by another bishop;"[13] so too Grot., Wetst., Vitr., Bengel, Herd., Stern, Rinck, Hengstenb., etc., offend against the latter idea, in maintaining a remembrance of the sword of the angel against Balaam,[14] or the sword whereby the misled Israelites were swept away,[15] or both.[16] Already the statement expressly added after ver. 16, ῥομφ. τοῦ στόματός μου, renders this impossible.

[1] Cf. also Heinr.
[2] Cf. ver. 20.
[3] N. de Lyra.
[4] Cf. on ver. 6.
[5] Herder.
[6] C. a Lap. Cf. Areth., Vitr., etc.
[7] Eichh., Herd., Züll., etc.
[8] Acts xv.
[9] Ver. 6.
[10] Heinr., Ewald, De Wette, Hengstenb., Ebrard, etc.
[11] Cf. i. 16.
[12] Grot.
[13] Calov.
[14] Num. xxii. 11.
[15] Num. xxxi. 8.
[16] Cf., on the other hand, Eichh., Heinr., Ewald, De Wette.

Ver. 17. *δώσω αὐτῷ τοῦ μάννα.* The partitive gen.[1] has its correct meaning no less than the immediately succeeding accus.[2] — The general sense of the promise is not to fail because of the parallel ideas at the close of all seven epistles.[3] The expressions are, at all events, as Areth. remarks on *ψηφ. λευκ.*, a *παροιμία ἐπὶ τῶν εὐδαιμόνως — ζώντων* (a maxim concerning those living happily), a description of future eternal blessedness and glory. This is misapplied by those who understand the *manna* as directly referring to the Lord's Supper,[4] or to the spiritual quickening and consolation imparted to believers even during their conflict in and with the world,[5] or as the figure of divine grace in general which becomes manifest in justification (*ψηφ. λευκ.*) and the offering of sonship (*ὄν. καιν*).[6] In the latter explanation, apart from the misunderstanding of the idea *ὁ νικῶν*, the groundless assertion is made, that *ἐπί* is equivalent to *σύν*.[7] The more specific explanation of details has occasioned much difficulty. Utterly inapplicable to the hidden manna is the allusion[8] to the Jewish opinion, that, before the destruction of the temple by Nebuchadnezzar, the prophet Jeremiah or the king Josiah had rescued and concealed the ark of the covenant, together with the holy relics contained therein, and that the Messiah at his appearance will again bring them to light.[9] Incorrect, too, is the view that Christ himself is the hidden manna.[10] Christ *gives* it. Incorrect is the view of Grot.: "*τ. κεκρυμμ.* is equivalent to *τοῦ νοητοῦ* (the intellectual), and designates the more exact knowledge not only of God's commands, but also of his dispensations." But rather,[11] as the victor has approved himself especially in resisting the temptation to eat of what is sacrificed to idols, so he receives a corresponding reward when the Lord offers him heavenly, divine food, viz., *manna*, the bread of heaven,[12] — such fruit as, like the fruit of the tree of life, ver. 7, will nourish the heavenly, blessed life. This manna is *hidden*, because it will be manifest only in future glory when it will be enjoyed; as, in a similar way, is said immediately afterwards of the new name.[13] — *ψῆφον λευκὴν, κ.τ.λ.* Without any foundation is the explanation of N. de Lyra,[14] according to which *the white stone* signifies the body decorated with the endowment of brilliancy, and the *new name* written thereon; "then every one manifestly and bodily blessed with the endowments of a glorious body, will be enrolled in the city of the celestials." In connection with the mention of the manna, the explanation of the white stone has been sought in the Jewish fable, that, besides the manna, precious stones and pearls were found in the wilderness;[15] or the decoration of the high priest at the time of the giving of the manna has been recalled, as he bore upon twelve precious stones (which, however, were

[1] Cf. Acts xxvii. 30.

[2] Cf. Winer, pp. 186, 539.

[3] Cf. especially ver. 7.

[4] Tichon., Beda. [5] C. a Lap., Boss.

[6] Wolf, after J. H. Majus.

[7] Wolf. Cf. also Luther: "A good testimony, and with the testimony."

[8] Wetst., Heinr., Ew.

[9] Cf. 2 Macc. ii. 1 sq. Abarbanel on 1 Sam. iv. 4: "This is the ark which Josiah hid before the devastation of our temple; and this ark, at a future time, when our Messiah comes, will be manifested."

[10] John vi.; Primas, N. de Lyra, Vitr. See on ver. 7.

[11] Cf. Bengel, De Wette, Hengstenb., Ebrard.

[12] Ps. lxxviii. 49, cv. 40.

[13] Cf. also 1 Cor. ii. 7 sqq.

[14] Cf. already Beda.

[15] Joma viii.: "Precious stones and pearls fell together with the manna upon the Israelites." In Wetst.

not called ψῆφος)[1] the names of the tribes of Israel, so that here is indicated the priestly dignity of the complete victors.[2] Others, likewise, in a certain connection with the mention of heavenly food, have combined the heathen custom, according to which the conquerors in the games were led to festive banquets, and otherwise rewarded with gifts of many kinds. Thus Vitruv.[3] reports: "To the noble athletes who conquered in the Olympian, Pythian, Nemean, and Isthmian games, the ancestors of the Greeks appointed honors so great that not only standing in the assembly with palm and garland they receive praise, but also when they return to their states in victory, they are in triumph drawn within the walls in a four-yoked chariot, and enjoy for their whole life, from the republic, a fixed income." The Roman emperors[4] also established such public games, from which the victors were led (ἐιςήλασαν) in triumph to their native city, and then received the deferred rewards. Titus was accustomed even to throw into the arena small wooden balls, on which were written orders for food, clothing, money, etc.; then the contestants received what the order proffered them stated.[5] According to this, *the white stone* is explained as the order for the heavenly reward,[6] as the "ticket" to the heavenly banquet.[7] Others, leaving out of consideration any connection between the manna and the white stone, recall the use of the lot among the Jews,[8] as well as among the Greeks and Romans, who were accustomed to ballot with small white stones or beans, called ψῆφοι, upon which names were written;[9] still others compare it with the classical usage of rendering a favorable judgment in trials by means of white stones, and thus find in this passage a representation of Christ's judgment preserving from condemnation, and introducing to blessedness by the sentence of justification.[10] Many expositors, again, have combined several of these references, viz., that of election (ἐκλογή) and justification.[11] But against all such definite antiquarian references is the decisive circumstance that the presentation of our passage truly agrees with not one of them. Hengstenb. is correct in saying,[12] "that the point coming here into consideration is only the fact that in antiquity many things were written on a small stone." Besides, the *white* color of the stone given the victor, which in itself represents the glory of the victory,[13] and the purity of the blessed in heaven,[14] retains its full significance. But what properly gives the white stone its worth is the inscription which it bears: Christ gives the

[1] Exod. xxviii. 17, xxxix. 10.

[2] Cf. Ew., Züll., Ebrard, Kliefoth.

[3] *L.*, ix., *Praef.*

[4] Cf., e.g., in reference to Trajan, Plin., *L.*, x. *Ep.* 119, 120.

[5] Xiphilin, *Epit. Dion.*, p. 228: σφαιρία γὰρ ξύλινα μικρὰ ἀνωθεν εἰς τὸ θέατρον ἐῤῥίπτει, σύμβολον ἔχοντα, τὸ μὲν ἐδωδίμου τινὸς, κ.τ.λ. — ἃ ἁρπασαντάς τινας ἔδει πρὸς τοὺς δωτῆρας αὐτῶν ἀπενεγκεῖν καὶ λαβεῖν τὸ ἐπιγεγραμμένον. Cf., in general, K. F. Hermann, *d. Gottesdienstl. Alterth. d. Griechen*, § 50; Not. 30 sqq. p. 254 sqq.

[6] Areth., Grot., Hammond, Eichh.

[7] Heinr., Ew. ii.: *Tessera hospitalitatis* (token of hospitality).

[8] Schöttgen: "I believe that allusion is made to the lot which was to be cast by the *priests* who wished to offer sacrifice. According to Tamid., fol. xvi. 1: "The prefect of the temple came at the hour of cock-crowing, and the priests open. Then he says to them: 'Let him who has been washed come and draw lots; he whom the lot touches is worthy of sacrificing.'"

[9] Elsner.

[10] Victorin., Erasmus, Zeger, C. a Lap., Aretius, Calov., Vitr., Wolf, etc.

[11] De Wette, Stern. Cf. also Beng.

[12] Cf. already Beng.

[13] vi. 2.

[14] iv. 4.

victor a *new name*, written upon the stone, — a name which no one knows except he who receives it. That the new name written upon the stone can in no way be the name of God,[1] is proved partly from the type of the ancient prophetic promise of a new name,[2] partly by the analogy of xix. 12, where what is said is concerning the *proper* name of Christ, and partly also from the rule given in the limitation ὁ οὐδείς, κ.τ.λ. The idea in iii. 12, xiv. 1, is of an entirely different nature. The opinion of Eichhorn also is to be rejected; viz., that the stone bore the inscription ὁ ἁγιος τῷ θεῷ καὶ τῷ αρνιῷ, which is called new in opposition to the ancient Jewish faith in God without the Lamb. But to the norms given above, corresponds the view advanced by most expositors, according to which the declaration refers to the *proper* name of the victor.[3] The name is *new*, because it designates the new glory of believers, i.e., that which is manifested only in the future life;[4] and only he having received the same knows it, because, as is the case likewise already in this life, the knowledge of the blessedness of eternal life is disclosed only in personal experience. But how that new name will sound, cannot be in any way answered according to this text. The answer given by most, that it is "son of God," or "elect," is applicable only as therein the general contents of the Christian hope are expressed.[5] [See Note XXXIII., p. 156.]

Vv. 18-29. The epistle to the church at Thyatira. — Thyatira, about nineteen hours from Pergamos, on the road thence to Sardis, not far from the river Lycus in Lydia, — now Akhissar, — was an inconsiderable city, belonging to the civil jurisdiction of Perg.[6] A dealer in purple, Lydia of Thyatira, is mentioned in Acts xvi. 14; but that she founded the Christian church there, — a presumption according to which Hengstenb. immediately connects "works of love" with the "female origin of the church," — is just as little to be asserted as there is foundation for the unfavorable supposition that Lydia may have been meant by Jezebel, ver. 20.[7] The church at Thyatira was, like the others in Asia, not purely Jewish-Christian, as Grot. thinks, in order to weaken an uncritical objection of the Alogi against the worth of the Apoc. But ver. 20 rather refers explicitly to heathen Christian elements.[8] — That Irenaeus could not have been the bishop[9] to whom John writes, is mentioned already by N. de Lyra. C. a Lap. and others name Carpus as bishop.[10]

Ver. 18. ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. The Lord, who in i. 13 appears like a son of man, is, as the entire description (i. 13 sqq.) shows, the Son of God, although he does not there receive that precise name. But in the present epistle he expressly designates himself as such, because, especially in ver. 27, this glory of his is asserted in accordance with Ps. ii. The two other designations, derived from i. 14, 15, have their significance in the fact that the Lord with his eyes of flame penetrates[11] all, and with his feet like brass treads down every thing impure and malevolent.[12]

[1] Ewald.
[2] Isa. lxii. 2, lxv. 15.
[3] Beda, Ribera, C. a Lap., L. Cappellus, Grot., Coccej., Vitr., Wolf, Bengel, De Wette, Hengstenb., Ebrard, etc.
[4] 1 John iii. 2; 1 Cor. xiii. 9 sqq.
[5] Rom. viii. 17; 1 John iii. 2.
[6] See on ver. 12 sqq.
[7] Cf. Heinr.
[8] "What had the Jews at that time to do with sacrifices to idols?"
[9] Angel. Cf. i. 20.
[10] Cf. on ver. 12 sqq.
[11] Cf. ver. 23.
[12] Cf. ver. 27.

Ver. 19. The works of the church (*οἰδά σου τὰ ἔργα*), as the Lord knows them, are first introduced by name, — the subordination of the four items *τ. ἀγάπην, τ. πίστιν, τ. διακονίαν*, and *τ. ὑπομονήν*, is noted by the attaching of the *σοῦ* only to the last,[1] — and then (*κ. τὰ ἔργα σου, κ.τ.λ.*) are commended as a whole, because a progress therein is shown. Two pairs are mentioned, and that, too, in such order that their individual members correspond to one another. The *ἀγάπη*, which already, because it precedes, is intended to refer in an altogether general way to love to God and the brethren, and not only to love to the poor,[2] proves itself in the *διακονία*, i.e., in kindness towards all needing help, especially the poor;[3] and the *πίστις*, i.e., faith, — not fidelity,[4] — proves itself in the *ὑπομονή*, i.e., faithful and patient perseverance founded upon the hope of faith, in the midst of attacks from the hostile world.[5] — *πλείονα τῶν πρώτων*. Cf. Matt. xii. 45; 2 Pet. ii. 20. The church at Ephesus (ver. 5), on the contrary, but in a similar way, had been reproved for a relapse.

Ver. 20. *ἀλλ' ἔχω κατὰ σοῦ ὅτι ἀφεῖς, κ.τ.λ.* Cf. ver. 4. Grot. incorrectly paraphrases: "I wish you to dismiss that wife." The sense of the *ἀφεῖς*[6] is correctly given by the var. *ἐᾷς*,[7] "that thou let alone." Connected with *τὴν γυναῖκα Ἰεσαβήλ*, but in an interrupted construction, is the appositive[8] *ἡ λεγ., κ.τ.λ.* The juncture proposed by Winer, p. 498, *ἣ λέγουσα — καὶ διδάσκει καὶ πλανᾷ*, is too refined, while the very harshness of the former inartificial construction corresponds with John's mode. The words *καὶ διδάσκει καὶ πλανᾷ* are to be regarded neither as a so-called hysteron proteron,[9] nor to be combined in *ἡ διδάσκουσα πλανᾷ*,[10] but the accus. *τ. ἐμ. δούλους* depends upon both verbs, while the infinitives *πορνεῦσαι καὶ φαγεῖν εἰδ.*, which are used with a certain looseness of construction, are nevertheless again connected with sufficient firmness by the prevailing meaning of the *διδάσκει*, which in its combination with *πλανᾷ* appears to refer to a false doctrine. — The explanation of the expression *τ. γυναῖκα Ἰεσαβήλ*[11] is a matter of controversy, which essentially depends upon the fact, that, as in ver. 14, neither the *πορνεῦσαι* nor even the *φαγεῖν εἰδωλ.* is to be understood figuratively or even only in a double sense.[12] The precedency of the *πορνεῦσαι* does not show that at Thyatira fornication prepared the way for eating sacrifices to idols,[13] which in itself, and in view of ver. 14, is improbable, as, on the contrary, the eating of sacrifices to idols gave occasion for unchastity; neither is it to be mentioned, that "in reference to ancient Jezebel, the history expressly intends only fornication, while in reference to Balaam the temptation to eat sacrifices offered to idols is also mentioned,"[14] for according to 1 Kings xviii. 19, xxi. 25 sqq., this is not entirely correct with respect to either Jezebel or Balaam.[15] Fornication precedes for

[1] Ebrard. Cf. ver. 2.
[2] Ew. Cf. ver. 4.
[3] Acts xi. 29; 1 Cor. xvi. 15; 2 Cor. ix. 12 sqq. Aretius, Grot., Beng., Heinr., Ew., De Wette, Ebrard. Calov., incorrectly: "διακ., the performance of the duties of the holy ministry."
[4] Beng., Ew. ii.
[5] Cf. i. 9.
[6] On this form, Winer, p. 77.
[7] John xi. 44, 48, xii. 7.
[8] Cf. i. 5, iii. 12, xiv. 12.
[9] *κ. πλανᾷ κ. διδ.* Pric.
[10] Grot.
[11] Cf. Critical Remarks.
[12] Of proper and improper fornication. Hengstenb.
[13] Bengel.
[14] Hengstenb.
[15] See on ver. 14.

the reasons for which (ver. 21)[1] it is alone named; viz., because it was the chief thing among the Nicolaitans in Thyatira. "The woman Jezebel" is manifestly represented as a teacher of a Balaamite or Nicolaitan character. If now "the woman Jez." collectively is to designate a party and "personified heresy,"[2] the body of Jews, the synagogue,[3] cannot be meant, — an explanation which only by the most unnatural artificialness is united with the declaration that the false doctrine of Jezebel alludes to *πορνεῦσαι* and *φαγ. εἰδωλ.*, — but the Nicolaitan false teachers must be represented under the figure of Jezebel.[4] But partly the designation *τὴν γυναῖκα*, which is attached to a name sufficient for that sense, partly the further limitation *ἡ λέγουσα ἑαυτ., κ.τ.λ.*, which has in itself something that is individual, decides the view that a particular woman is meant; not the wife of a bishop,[5] nor a woman who is actually called Jezebel,[6] but some woman who under the pretence of being a prophetess had approved the doctrines of the Nicolaitans, and for that reason was designated a new Jezebel, as Ahab's wife formerly in the O. T. church, by the introduction of the worship of Baal, and fornication,[7] which was combined with the worship of Baal and Ashtaroth, gave the greatest offence.[8] That the woman in Thyatira did not actually have the name Jezebel, but rather that this name was understood symbolically, does not follow from the fact that in the Apoc. all names except that of the composer are of a symbolical character,[9] for that is not the case;[10] but from the fact that it is applied to the false doctrines and godlessness, which have been designated already by the name of Balaam, of entirely similar notoriety with that of the wife of Ahab.

Ver. 21. This misleader's worthiness of punishment[11] is increased by the fact that she had time for repentance, and yet will not repent. Thus by the *καί* this point is added to the guilt mentioned in ver. 20. — *ἔδωκα, κ.τ.λ.*, designates not the unsearchable decree of God in relation to "the speedy coming" of the Lord, that a time for repentance should still be open, but in connection with which it is *predicted* that the same will not be utilized;[12] but a time of repentance is designated, the discerning of which, indeed, lies in an act of the Lord's grace that is now past (*ἔδωκα*),[13] but which, as the pres. *ὐ θέλει μετανοῆσαι* shows, is to be regarded as continuing still to the present, and that, too, fruitlessly. Thus there is no ground for the opinion[14] that John had already before published a written rebuke. But it is correctly inferred[15] that the woman Jezebel had for a long time already exercised her corrupt activity. Even the fact that she had been let go[16] appears from the standpoint of Divine Providence to afford an opportunity for a time of re-

[1] Cf. also ver. 22.
[2] Hengstenb.
[3] Alcas., Züll.
[4] Andr., Areth., Vitr., Eichh., Hengstenb., Ebrard.
[5] Grot., Klief., who regards the *σου* after *γυν.* as indisputable.
[6] Wolf, Beng.
[7] 2 Kings ix. 22; 1 Kings xxi. 23 sqq.; 2 Kings iii. 2, ix. 30 sqq.
[8] C. a Lap., Calov., Heinr., Herd., Ew., De Wette, Stern, etc.
[9] Hengstenb.
[10] Cf. ver. 13.
[11] Cf. ver. 22.
[12] Ebrard.
[13] Cf. Winer, p. 80. Ebrard inaccurately paraphrases the aor. after the manner of the present.
[14] Ew. ii.
[15] Ew., De Wette.
[16] Cf. ver. 20.

pentance, although the church must on this account be censured. — The ἐκ after μεταν.[1] naturally stands as a designation of the movement out of sins. — The πορνεία — not "inaccurately stated for immodest pursuits leading to inchastity"[2] — is meant precisely as in ver. 20 (ver. 14). Fornication in its various forms was properly the heart of the error.

Vv. 22, 23. The ἰδού so strongly emphasizes the succeeding threat, and makes us so to expect something new in comparison with ver. 21, that the discredited ἐγώ appears in an exegetical respect entirely superfluous. — Already the βάλλω αὐτ. shows that the κλίνη is a bed which the woman takes only when so compelled. Yet the κλίνη does not designate the punishments in hell,[3] but the sick-bed,[4] in opposition to the bed of sensuality. But by this description of such judgment, the reference to Jezebel and her entirely different[5] punishment is abandoned,[6] so that even in ver. 23, in the words κ. τ. τέκνα αὐτ., an allusion to the destruction of the sons of Ahab[7] dare not be sought. The punishment of the woman and her companions, without regard to the significant designation existing in the name Jezebel, is determined in accordance with the manner of their sins. It is to be observed, however, that the expression now chosen, μοιχεύειν — τ. μοιχ. μετ' αὐτῆς, i.e., those who shared in her deeds,[8] designates the entire conduct of the woman and her party in a double sense, embracing the πορνεία and the φαγ. εἰδωλ., since the ethnicizing disorder must be punished more than adultery in a theocratical-symbolical sense, as in fact actual fornication was what was chiefly designed. Thus the μοιχεύοντες μετ' αὐτῆς are those who perform τὰ ἔργα αὐτῆς, i.e., the works taught and practised by the woman; or as in ver. 23 it is again said, according to another application of the symbolical idea,[9] τὰ τέκνα αὐτῆς,[10] and therefore not actually bastards.[11] Incorrectly, N. de Lyra: gehenna. It is possible to think of a pest,[12] because the LXX. have rendered the Heb. דֶּבֶר, Ezek. xxxiii. 27, by θάνατος. Meanwhile it is sufficient to leave the matter in its universality; the entire formula ἀποκτ. ἐν θανάτῳ then in its fulness corresponds in some measure to the Hebrew mode of combining an infin. with the finite tense of its root, as, e.g., Lev. xx. 10, where the punishment of adultery is stated מוֹת־יוּמַת (LXX., θανάτῳ θανατούς θωσαν). But any allusion to this precise passage is, to say the least, doubtful. The independence of the Johannean formula, notwithstanding its adoption of Hebraic modes of statement, lies partly in the distinction between the words ἀποκτενῶ and θανάτῳ, and partly in the fact that by the addition of the preposition ἐν the precise idea of the means[13] is marked. — καὶ γνώσονται, κ.τ.λ. Every judgment of the Lord upon the world is a revelation of his glory, and has the intentional result to advance and strengthen believers more and more in their knowledge. Thus the idea of the γνωσ. is entirely too general[14] to

[1] Ver. 22. Cf. Acts viii. 22: ἀπό.
[2] De Wette.
[3] Beda, N. de Lyra. Cf. also C. a Lap., Tirin.
[4] Ps. xli. 4.
[5] 2 Kings ix. 31 sqq.
[6] Against Herder, etc.
[7] 2 Kings x. 7. Züll., Ebrard.
[8] Areth., Vitr., Ew., De Wette, etc.
[9] Cf. Isa. lvii. 3.
[10] Areth., N. de Lyra, Calov., Vitr., Eichh., De Wette, Stern, Hengstenb., Ebrard, Ew. ii.
[11] Aretius, Grot., Beng., Ew., Klief.
[12] Grot., Vitr., Wetst., Bengel, Ewald, etc. Cf. vi. 8.
[13] Cf. ver. 16.
[14] Cf. Joel iv. 17; Isa. xxxvii. 20.

admit of any special opposition to the false gnosis[1] of the Nicolaitans. It is different with ver. 24. — *πᾶσαι αἱ ἐκκλ.* Not only the Asiatic;[2] but rather, as the judgment upon false teachers in Thyatira is an act which belongs to the coming of the Lord, so also this special act shares in the absolutely universal significance of Christ's final appearance. — *ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι, κ.τ.λ.* A forcible designation of the person of whom so great a thing is said as *ὁ ἐρεύνων, κ.τ.λ.* Cf. Ps. vii. 10. The Son of God who executes judgment (*καὶ δώσω, κ.τ.λ.*) has also the divine attribute of searching the deepest recesses of man, and thus the condition for just judgment,[3] as he has both eyes as a flame of fire, and feet like brass.[4] — *νεφροὺς καὶ καρδίας.* According to Grot. and Beng., the former is intended to designate the desires, and the latter the thoughts. But the expression designates rather the entire inner part without any distinction of the two points. — *ὑμῖν.* An animated turn to those guilty.[5] Cf. ver. 24. — *κατὰ τὰ ἔργα ὑμων.* Because the Lord, who recognizes the inner source of the works, sees also their worth.[6]

Vv. 24, 25. In opposition (*δὲ*) to the Nicolaitans spoken of at the close of ver. 23, the Lord now addresses that part of the church not infected by such false doctrines; by the words *οἵτινες, κ.τ.λ.*, the rest are then expressly characterized as such as had not received this doctrine, this not godly, but satanic, gnosis. The reference to the so-called gnosis of the Nicolaitans is here clearly indicated by the expression *τὰ βαθέα*, even apart from the controverted formula *ὡς λέγουσιν*; for to become acquainted with the depths (of divinity) was an essential pretence of the Gnostics[7] But it is a matter of controversy, whether the expression *τ. βαθέα τ. σατ.* should be conceived of as a self-chosen designation of Gnostic erroneous doctrine concerning the "rest,"[8] so that *οὐκ ἔγνωσαν* and *ὡς λέγουσιν* have the same subject, or whether the Nicolaitan Gnostics are to be regarded as the subject to *ὡς λέγουσιν*, so that the expression *τὰ βαθέα τ. σατ.* is used either entirely as it sounds in the sense of these Gnostics,[9] or according to the analogy of the designation *συναγωγὴ τοῦ σατανᾶ*, ver. 9, as a sarcastic transformation of the Gnostic expression concerning the depths; viz., as they say, of the Deity, but as it is rather in fact meant, of Satan.[10] But if, in the former sense, the entire formula *τὰ βαθέα τοῦ σατανᾶ* were to be understood as one in itself peculiar to the Gnostics (*ὡς λεγ.*), it must also be shown how it was used by them; but this does not occur. Hence the view commends itself, that the expression *τὰ βαθέα τ. σατ.* is to be conceived of from the Christian standpoint. At the same time it appears far more forcible if the Gnostics themselves be regarded as the subject to *ὡς λέγουσιν* with respect to the chief idea *τὰ βαθέα*, while the further

[1] Hengstenb.

[2] Grot.

[3] Jer. xi. 20, xvii. 10.

[4] Ver. 18.

[5] Grotius, De Wette.

[6] Cf. De Wette.

[7] "If, in good faith, you ask them a question, they answer, with stern look and contracted brow, that 'it is deep.'" Tertull., *Adv. Valent.*, i. — "Who say that they have come to the depths of the depth." Iren., *Adv. Haer.*, ii. 38, 1. Pref.: *βαθέα μυστήρια*, "deep mysteries."

[8] Andr., Areth., Heinr., Züllig, Stern, Ebrard.

[9] Neander, *Apost. Zeitalt.*, 3d ed. ii. p. 532. Hengstenb., Gebhardt, Klief.

[10] So Vitr.: "The *ὡς λέγουσιν* is to be referred absolutely to the *τὰ βαθέα*." The word "of Satan" is added by the Lord himself.

determination of τοῦ σατανᾶ is made prominent, in that the question in fact is not concerning divine depths,[1] nor divine mysteries,[2] but the depths of Satan, as if this judgment were put in the mouths of believers at Thyatira who remained faithful, and they therefore are regarded as the subject to the ὡς λέγουσιν. — To the rest at Thyatira the Lord now says, οὐ βάλλω — ἥξω. The expression ἄλλο βάρος has been understood in two chief respects, but with very different modifications of exposition; viz., either of the burden of suffering and punishment, or of the burden of a law. The norm furnished by the context, for the explanation of an expression in itself ambiguous, lies in the words πλὴν ὃ ἔχ., κ.τ.λ., which in no way contain the condition of the promise οὐ βάλλω ἐρ' ὑμ. ἄλλο βάρ.,[3] but a certain limitation (πλήν) of the preceding promise, as the πλήν is correlate to ἄλλο. If now in the words ver. 25, the manifestation of Christian steadfastness in faith is required, and therefore a certain incessant legal determination is made or established, the result is that every ἄλλο βάρος must likewise be a burden of the law, which, just because it reaches farther than the limitation indicated in the closing words (ver. 25), should not be laid upon believers. If now it be considered that the question at issue was with respect to fornication and the eating of sacrifices made to idols, and that just in respect to this the ancient church at the Synod of Jerusalem, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, made a definite decision, but declined all going beyond this as an intolerable burden,[4] we could not recognize hence a clear allusion to that decree; and accordingly explain the ἄλλο βάρος of any sort of legal limitation of the holy freedom of believers, which proceeds beyond the commandment hitherto faithfully preserved by them.[5] The ὃ ἔχετε, nevertheless, is not directly the formerly recognized and still faithfully observed prohibition to avoid fornication and the eating of what is sacrificed to idols; but the expression in its indefinite extent includes the idea that because believers have been faithful in opposition to the Nicolaitans, just in their obedience they have also had their reward, viz., the blessing of eternal life, and therefore should hold fast to this treasure,[6] while they bear still further the burden of that commandment which was hitherto borne. If the ἄλλο βάρος, therefore, be understood of the burden of suffering, it can be explained only, with De Wette: "No other sorrow than you bear or have borne already." For we must infer from the mention of the ὑπομονή, ver. 19, that suffering was already borne; while, in case this reference were to ἄλλο βάρος, a more definite allusion to suffering previously endured would be expected. Incorrectly, Heinr.: "Punishment because of another's fault." Incorrectly, Grot.: "They boast of the knowledge of many things; this I do not exact of you," as though the gnosis were the ἄλλο βάρος. Incorrectly, Beng. (whom Klief. follows): "As they had borne the burden of Jezebel and her followers sufficiently."

Vv. 26-28. The promise to the victor. — The combination with ver. 25, indicated by the καί,[7] lies in the fact that the victory is won by the τηρεῖν ἄχρι

[1] Cf. 1 Cor. ii. 10; Rom. xi. 33.
[2] Iren., *Adv. Haer.*, i. 1, ii. 39, 48.
[3] Ebrard.
[4] Acts xv. 28.
[5] Cf. Primas, N. de Lyra, C. a Lap., Stern, Hengstenb. Cf. also Ew. ii.
[6] Cf. iii. 11.
[7] Cf. Bengel, De Wette, Hengstenb.

τέλους τὰ ἔργα μου, which in meaning is nothing else than the κρατεῖν commanded in ver. 25. With respect to the form of the expression, the τηρεῖν corresponds to the κρατεῖν, the ἄχρι τέλους to the ἄχρι οὗ ἂν ἥξω. The τὰ ἔργα μου find their explanation partly in opposition to the works of Jezebel,[1] and partly in combination with ver. 25; they are such works as the Lord requires by the commandment which he imposes. Incorrectly, Grotius: Metonymy, for ἔργα are said to be precepts concerning works. — Concerning the broken construction of the sentence, ver. 26, as the αὐτῷ refers back to absolute preceding nominative ὁ νικῶν, κ.τ.λ., cf. Winer, pp. 170, 533. — The substantial sense of the promise δώσω — πατρός μου is that the victor is to share in the work of establishing the βασιλεία[2] at the coming of the Lord. For just as the Son has already received (εἴλ.) from the Father power over the heathen, that he breaks them like earthen vessels with a rod of iron,[3] so also will they who believe in Jesus Christ be raised by him, their Mediator, through whom they have already at the present time the kingdom,[4] to participation in the glory which then becomes manifest.[5] The coming of the Lord completely and actually effects the victory over all that is hostile; and he who remains faithful until that coming will then receive as a reward the royal glory in its fuller development, whose possession in faith has already conditioned the victory over all temptations or persecutions on the part of the world. Incorrectly Grot., on ἐξουσ. ἐπὶ τ. ἐθν.: "I will raise him to the grade of presbyter, that he may judge concerning those who live not in a Christian but a heathen way;" and ver. 27 of excommunication.[6] The conversion of the heathen, also, we must regard neither alone,[7] nor with the addition of the idea of the future royal dominion.[8] — ποιμανεῖ[9] according to the LXX., Ps. ii 9, for תְּרֹעֵם (break), is interchanged with תִּרְעֵת (feed). — In the epistle to the church at Thyatira, this promise has its reference to the opposition to the heathen libertinism of Jezebel and her party. — κ. δώσω αὐτῷ τὸν ἀστ. τ. πρ., ver. 28, cannot be like θήσω αὐτόν, κ.τ.λ.[10] That the morning star which Christ will give to the victor is "the glorious body refulgent with the endowment of brilliancy,"[11] is an entirely arbitrary assumption of exegetical helplessness; while still others have advanced the idea, with allusion to Isa. xiv. 12, that by the morning star the Devil is to be understood,[12] or the Babylonian, i.e., the most powerful king of the world.[13] According to xxii. 16, to understand Christ himself[14] is impossible because of the δώσω, which makes us expect[15] a gift of the Lord. According to the analogy of Dan. xii. 3, Matt. xiii. 43, 1 Cor. xv. 40 sqq., the expression in general designates the bright glory,[16] the heavenly δόξα,[17]

[1] Ver. 22. Eichh., Heinr., Ewald, etc.
[2] Cf. xix. 15, xii. 5.
[3] Cf. Ps. ii. 8, 9.
[4] i. 6, 9.
[5] iii. 21, xx. 6.
[6] ῥαβδ. σιδ. = word of God, a part of which is excommunication.
[7] Cf. Primas, Beda, Alcas., who immediately regard the iron rod as a designation of the bishop's crosier.
[8] Cf. Ebrard.
[9] Cf. xii. 5, xix. 15.
[10] Eichh. Cf. also Heinr.
[11] N. de Lyra. Cf. ver. 17.
[12] Cf. Rom. xvi. 20. Andr., Areth.
[13] Züll.
[14] Primas, Beda, Alcas., C. a Lap., Calov., Vitr., Wolf, Beng., Stern, Ebrard, Klief.
[15] Vv. 17, 10.
[16] Aretius.
[17] De Wette. Cf. also Hengstenb.

with which the victor is to be endowed, without regarding ἀστήρ itself as used[1] of nothing else than "brilliancy and rays of the star."[2] Yet it is difficult for the discourse to be in reference to a domination of the star, similar to that in what precedes.[3] The bold poetical idea appears rather to be, that the victor beams in the brilliancy of the morning star, because he has the morning star in his possession, just as a precious stone adds its effulgence to those who wear it. [See Note XXXIV., p. 157.]

Notes by the American Editor.

XXVIII. Ver. 2.

Hengstenberg calls attention to the danger incurred, when any special duty is incumbent upon the Church, of so concentrating all energies upon it that other spheres are neglected, and to the excuse for this neglect given by conscience on the ground of its activity in the one direction. So intent was the church of Ephesus in properly withstanding errorists, and in its toilsome labors in this cause, that love was vanishing, though the earnestness originally prompted by love remains. A superficial legal orthodoxism, and a zeal in good works, are gradually supplanting the life-communion with Christ which is the soul and centre of a normal church life. Alford agrees with Düst., that the τὸν κόπον καὶ τὴν ὑπομονήν are epexegetical of τὰ ἔργα. Concerning the hardship implied in the τὸν κόπον, cf. Matt. xxvi. 10; Luke xi. 7, xviii. 5; 2 Cor. xi. 27; Gal. vi. 17. It and its derivative κοπιάω are especially applied to the service of ministering the word, John iv. 38; Rom. xvi. 12; 1 Cor. xv. 10, 58 (cf. 1 Cor. iv. 12); 2 Cor. vi. 5, x. 15, xi. 23, 27; 1 Cor. xvi. 16; Gal. iv. 11; Phil. ii. 16; Col. i. 29; 1 Thess. ii. 9, iii. 5, iv. 10; 2 Thess. iii. 8; 1 Tim. iv. 10, v. 17; Heb. vi. 10; and are most suitable to the interpretation of the ἀγγέλος, as the bishop or pastor of the church. Hence the practical point of Trench: "How often does labor which esteems itself labor for Him stop very short of this! Perhaps, in our day, none are more tempted continually to measure out to themselves tasks too light and inadequate than those to whom an office and ministry in the church have been committed. Others, in almost every other calling, have it measured out to them. We give to it exactly the number of hours which we please. We may well keep this word κόπος, and all that it signifies, viz., labor unto weariness, in mind." The note of the same author on οὐ βαστάσαι κακούς is also pertinent: "The infirmities, even the sins, of *weak* brethren, these are burdens which we may, nay, which we are commanded to bear (cf. Gal. vi. 2, where the same word βαστάζειν is used): it is otherwise with *false* brethren (Ps. cxix. 115, cix. 21, 22; 1 Cor. v. 11)."

XXIX. Ver. 6. τῶν Νικολαϊτῶν.

The argument in the long and thorough discussion in Gebhardt (pp 206–216) is to prove the distinction between the Nicolaitans and those errorists mentioned in ver. 2, "them which say they are apostles," etc., referring to Judaizing teachers, the conflict with whom is now in the background, while, with Düst., he regards the Nicolaitans as ethnicizing teachers of an Antinomian type. He traces the two classes, as prophesied already by St. Paul in his charge to the

[1] Ew. ii. wishes to insert the entire promise of ver. 28 into iii. 5, and then to interpret ἀστ. according to i. 20.

[2] xii. 1. Heinr., Ewald.

[3] Cf. De Wette.

elders of Ephesus, Acts xxviii. 29, 30, the latter verse referring to those here mentioned. Sieffert (*Herzog, R. E.*): "Gentile Christian Antinomians who abused Paul's doctrine of freedom." Schultze (in Zöckler's *Handbuch*): "A Gnostic Antinomianism, against which Paul had contended in the Epistle to the Colossians, and especially Jude, and Peter in his Second Epistle; and whose adherents John means in his First Epistle, by the name of antichrists, combining with false gnosis docetic error and a heathen life, as the head of whom Cerinthus appeared (Iren., i. 26; Euseb., iii. 28)."

XXX. Ver. 10. *ἡμερῶν δέκα.*

So Alford: "The expression is probably used to signify a short and limited time (Gen. xxiv. 55; Num. xi. 19; Dan. i. 12. See also Num. xiv. 22; 1 Sam. i. 8; Job xix. 3; Acts xxv. 6)." Also Trench. Luthardt: "A human measure, so that it is endurable." Stier: "Whatever may be the fact with regard to these uncertain historical circumstances, the general meaning of this word will assure us that all times of tribulation are measured before the Lord, and that they will be cut short for salvation (Matt. xxiv. 22)." Plumptre, however, following Bähr's *Symbolik:* "The number ten, the representative of completeness, and here, therefore, of persecution carried to its full extent, and lacking nothing that could make it thorough and perfect."

XXXI. Ver. 11. *ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ δευτέρου.*

Cremer: that "to which they are appointed whose names are not written in the book of life, and which follows the general resurrection (xx. 12–15), must be a judgment which comes as a second and final sentence, and which is something still future before the first resurrection, for the partakers of that resurrection are not affected by it (xx. 6). Their perfect freedom from all the consequences of sin, and the full realization of their salvation, is also expressed in ii. 11." Gebhardt: "The second death, the intensified death, is the coming of sins to the eternal death, from which there is no resurrection; or to perdition (comp. xvii. 8, 11), which consists, not in the 'destruction of the wicked,' but in the definite loss of happiness, in eternally restless pangs, and perpetual consciousness of consummated death." Trench quotes the gloss of Augustine: "Vita damnatorum est mors," and notes, "The *δευτέρος θάνατος* of this book is the *γέενα* of Matt. v. 29; Mark ix. 43–49; Luke xii. 5."

XXXII. Vv. 14, 15.

Alford: "We may remark: (1) That it is most according to the sense of the passage to understand these sins in the case of the Nicolaitans, as in that of those whom Balaam tempted, literally, and not mystically; (2) That the whole sense of the passage is against the identity of the Balaamites and Nicolaitans, and would be, in fact, destroyed by it. The mere existence of the etymological relation [see Düst. on ver. 6] is extremely doubtful." So also Gebhardt. Trench identifies the Balaamites and Nicolaitans.

XXXIII. Ver. 17. *μάννα. ψῆφον λευκὴν.*

Trench: "The words, 'the hidden manna,' imply, that, however hidden now, its meaning shall not remain hidden evermore; and the best commentary on them is to be found at 1 Cor. ii. 9; 1 John iii. 2. The seeing Christ as he is, of

the latter passage, and, through this beatific vision, being made like to him, is identical with this eating of the hidden manna, which shall, as it were, be then brought forth from the sanctuary, the holy of holies, of God's immediate presence, where it was withdrawn from sight so long that all may partake of it; the glory of Christ, now shrouded and concealed, being then revealed to his people." Following Züllig, he has an elaborate argument to prove that there is a reference in "the white stone" to the Urim and Thummim, on the ground that ψῆφος, in later Greek, means "a precious stone," and λευκὸς indicates "the purest glistering white" of the diamond; both the manna and the white stone "representing high-priestly privileges, which the Lord should at length impart to all his people, kings and priests unto God." This is refuted by Plumptre in Smith's *Bible Dictionary*, article "Urim and Thummim;" and in his commentary, where he adopts Ewald's view, "who sees in the stone or ψῆφος of the promise, the *tessera hospitalis*, by which, in virtue of forms or characters inscribed upon it, he who possessed it could claim from the friend who gave it, at any distance of time, a frank and hearty welcome. What I would suggest as an addition to this rises out of the probability, almost certainty, that some such *tessera* or ticket — a stone with the name of the guest written on it — was given to those who were invited to partake, within the precincts of the temple, of the feast that consisted wholly, or in part, of the meat that had been offered as a sacrifice. On this view, the second part of the promise is brought in harmony with the first, and is made more directly appropriate: he who had the courage to refuse that *tessera* to the feast that defiled should receive another that would admit him to the supper of the Great King." On the last clause, Plumptre: "The inner truth that lies below the outward imagery would seem to be, that the conqueror, when received at the heavenly feast, should find upon the stone, or *tessera*, that gave him the right of entrance, a 'new name,' the token of a character transformed and perfected, — a name, the full significance of which should be known only to him who was conscious of the transformation, just as, in the experiences of our human life, 'the heart knoweth his own bitterness, and the stranger doth not intermeddle with his joy' (Prov. xiv. 10)."

XXXIV. Ver. 28. *τὸν ἀστέρα τὸν πρωινόν.*

Luthardt, briefly: "That the new day of Jesus Christ is to break upon him." So Stier does not approve of the application of the words, in this connection, to Christ himself, but finds in them first the messenger heralding the day, and then the beginning of participation in the heavenly kingdom. According to his scheme of interpretation, he finds the first realization of this in the Reformation. Tait: "A share in my kingdom at its first manifestation." Plumptre, on the other hand: "The fruition of his glorious presence. . . . When he gives that star, he gives himself (ch. xxii. 16). The star had of old been the emblem of sovereignty; cf. Num. xxiv. 17; Matt. ii. 2. It was the symbol of sovereignty on its brighter and benignant side, and was, therefore, the fitting and necessary complement of the attributes which had gone before. The king came not only to judge and punish and destroy, but also to illumine and cheer (Luke i. 78). . . . The conqueror in the great strife should receive light in its fulness, and transmit that light to others (Dan. xii. 3)."

CHAPTER III.

Ver. 1. The art. before *ὄνομα* (rec.) is, according to A, C, ℵ, 11, 12, al., with Beng. and the more modern critics, to be deleted. — The *καί* before *ζῇς*, occurring instead of *ὅτι*, defended by Mill (*Prol.*, § 1007 sqq.), received by Matth., follows *ὅτι* (Beng., Griesb., etc.) in a diplomatic as well as exegetical regard. — Ver. 2. *στήρισον*, according to A, C, 4, 6, 8, etc., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]; cf. Luke xxii. 32; Winer, p. 85. The form *στήριξον* (rec., ℵ, Beng.) is, like the variations *στηρίζων* and *τήρησον*, an emendation. — *μέλλει ἀποθανεῖν*, rec. Yet the *μέλλει* has scarcely support in Arethas. Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.] have written correctly according to A, C, ℵ, 12, 28, Vulg., Syr., *ἔμελλον*, to which the emendation *ἔμελλεν* (*ἤμελλεν*, 16) also points. The var. *ἔμελες* (*ἔμελλες*, *ἠμελλες*) occurs in such witnesses (2, 3, 4, 6, al., Arab., Matth.) as propose *ἀποβάλλειν* (*ἀποβαλεῖν*) instead of the sufficiently guaranteed *ἀποθανεῖν* (A, ℵ, Vulg., Syr., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]; besides which there is also the var. *ἀποθνήσκειν — τοῦ θεοῦ μου*), A, C, ℵ, 2, 6, 7, 9, al., Vulg., Syr., Andr., al., Griesb., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]. The omission of the pronoun in some witnesses (see Beng., rec.) is, perhaps, not without a theological purpose. — Ver. 3. The words *καὶ ἤκουσας καὶ τήρει*, Matth. has deleted according to his five Codd. (cf. 2, 3, 4, 6, al., in Wetst.), but against A, C, ℵ, Vulg., rec. edd. — *ἐπί σε* before *ὡς κλ.* (rec., ℵ, against A, 12, 28, Vulg., al.) is derived from the conclusion. — Ver. 4. *καὶ* before *ἐν Σαρδ.* (rec.) rejected already by Mill (*Prol.*, § 1248) and Griesb. upon the ground of A, C, 2, 4, 6, al. — Instead of *ἃ οὐκ ἐμολ.* (rec. A, B, C, ℵ, al.), Tisch. (1859) for not improbable, inner reasons has written *ὃ* (Vulg., al.). — Ver. 5. Instead of *οὗτος* (rec., Tisch.), read *οὕτως*, according to A, C, ℵ, 2, 3, 9, al., Vulg., Lach., Tisch. IX. [W. and H.]. — Ver. 9. The form *διδῶ* (Lach. [W. and H.]) is, according to A, C, to be preferred to *δίδωμι* of the rec. edd.; cf. ii. 20, *ἀφεῖς*, ℵ: *δέδωκα*, incorrectly from ver. 8. — Instead of *ἥξωσιν κ. προσκυνήσωσιν* (rec., Griesb., Beng., Matt.), read *ἥξουσιν κ. προσκυνήσουσιν* according to A, C, ℵ, 14, 28 (Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]). Concerning the ind. fut. after *ἵνα* (xxii. 14, vi. 11, xiv. 13), cf. Winer, p. 271. — Ver. 12. *ἡ καταβαίνουσα*, A, C, ℵ$_1$, 12, 15, al., Griesb., Beng., etc.; cf. ii. 20. Elz.: *ἣ καταβαίνει*. — Ver. 15. *εἷς*, rec. But, according to C, ℵ, 2, 4, al., read *ἧς* (Mill, *Prol.*, § 1111; Beng., Lach., Tisch., Griesb.: *ᾗς*); cf. 2 Cor. xi. 1. — Ver. 17. The article before *ἐλεεινός* (A, 6, 11, al., Griesb., Lach., Treg., Tisch.) is uncertain (ℵ corr.). It is wanting in C (Lach., Tisch. IX. [W. and H.]), and grammatically is not to be expected. — Ver. 19. Instead of *ζῆλωσον* (rec., ℵ), read *ζήλευε* according to A, C, 2, 4, 9, al., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]. The emendation *ζῆλου* (in Wetst.) also occurs.

Vv. 1-6. The epistle to the church at Sardis.

Sardis, the ancient capital of the kings of Lydia, of whom Crœsus was the last, in a rich plain irrigated by the auriferous Pactolus, bounded on the south by Mount Tmolus, lying about thirteen hours south of Thyatira, and

three days' journey east of Ephesus, was distinguished for its wealth and luxury. Under Tiberius, Sardis, with twelve other cities, suffered severely from an earthquake, and was restored by the assistance of the emperor.[1] In the history of the Christian Church, it does not again appear until the middle of the second century, and then as the residence of the Bishop Melito.[2] The present Sardis is a paltry village.

The church at Sardis is severely reproved; yet it is rather intimated than expressly said as to wherein its wrong consisted. We are not to think of a proper, i.e., intentional hypocrisy,[3] but of a mode of life which did not agree with the confession firmly maintained externally.[4] Its members had a dead[5] faith; they faltered in their faith, and lacked the works, and the holy, pure life, which proceed from the living power of the true faith.[6]— The supposition of Ewald, that their heathenish life protected the Christians at Sardis from being annoyed by the heathen, and, that, for this reason, nothing is said in the epistle concerning *θλῖψις* and *ὑπομονή*, is only reconciled with the text with great difficulty. At all events, the church had enough Christian appearance (ver. 1) to restrain the friendship of the heathen. But whether it had actually experienced no form of *θλῖψις*, even not from the Jews, and how this perhaps occurred, is not perceptible.

Ver. 1. *ὁ ἔχων τὰ ἑπτὰ πνεύματα τοῦ θεοῦ.* This designation of the Lord is new rather as to form than as to sense; for Christ would not be everywhere Lord of the Church in the sense declared by the following predicate, and the entire description recurring in the commencement of the epistles (i. 12 sqq.), if he were not the one "having the seven spirits of God."[7] Christ, as the Son of God, has[8] the Spirit of God, as of the Father; thus Christ works and speaks through the Spirit in and to the churches,[9] and thus both designations of the Lord, *ὁ ἔχων τὰ ἑπτὰ πνευμ. τ. θ.* and (*ὁ ἔχων*) *τοὺς ἑπτὰ ἀστέρας*,[10] appear in their inner connection.[11] But, just because the *ἔχειν τ. ἑ. πν. τ. θ.* applies to Christ in his relation to his Church, not as something particular, but as something general, and as expressing a principle, the declaration *ὁ ἔχων, κ.τ.λ.*, cannot be referred like, e.g., *ὁ ἔχ. τ. ὀφθαλμούς, κ.τ.λ.* (ii. 18), etc., in the beginning of the epistles, to any special manifestation of the Lord; neither to his omniscience, according to which he tries the hearts and reins, and also judges aright what is hidden;[12] nor to his unlimited power to punish and reward.[13] The Lord designates himself, in general, as the one from whom the spiritual life-forces of the Church proceed,[14] and who thus continually rules in his churches,[15] sending forth the seven spirits as his Spirit, and speaking, reproving, warning, consoling, and promising through the same. In a like general way, the relation of Christ to the churches (ii. 1, iii. 14) is made prominent; yea, even the more special features in the

1 Tacitus, *Ann.*, ii. 47.
2 Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 13, 26; v. 24.
3 Vitr.
4 Cf. Ebrard.
5 Vv. 1, 2.
6 Cf. vv. 2, 3, 4.
7 Cf. i. 4.
8 Cf. v. 6.
9 Cf., e.g., ii. 7, 11, 17, etc., with the introductions to the epistles.
10 Cf. i. 16, 20.
11 Cf. also Bengel, Ewald, Hengstenb., Ebrard.
12 Vitr., Züll., De Wette.
13 Hengstenb.
14 Beng.
15 Ebrard.

other titles to the epistles, with their more precise references to the special contents of the epistles, have, at the same time, an entirely general significance, and make known the specific position of the Lord with respect to his churches in general. Hence it is an arbitrary assumption, when Ebrard lays emphasis upon the fact that Christ, "in the first part of his missive, does not appeal to that point in his manifestation [1] which afterwards [2] is established with special reference to Sardis,[3] viz., to the white robe; but to his general relation to all the seven churches." There is, therefore, no foundation whatever for the explanation of this "remarkable" circumstance, by the fact that the epistle to the church at Sardis has, in addition to its historical, a special "prophetical sense;" and, as the first of the epistles referring to the "synchronistic" condition of the church, it symbolizes that "among the ecclesiastical bodies which arose in consequence of the Reformation," in which "there was a possession and boast of pure doctrine, while there was such an over-estimate of doctrine and the objective institution of the Church, that, on that account, the continual reformation of the life was neglected." [4]

Upon *οἶδα* depends, first of all, the accus. *σου τὰ ἔργα*, then the clause *ὅτι ὄν. ἔχ., κ.τ.λ.*, before which a *καὶ* dare not be inserted.[5] The inner relation of the two expressions placed alongside of one another, without an express combination, is that the Lord, just because of his knowledge of the imperfection of the works of the church (ver. 2), knows that the same, although it has the name that it lives, is nevertheless, in truth, dead. The expression *ὄνομα ἔχεις* refers neither to the individual name of the bishop, as Zosimus, Vitalis, etc.,[6] nor to the name of his office;[7] but designates the reputation and esteem of the church,[8] yet in its opposition to actual truth, which is then expressly made prominent.[9] The "life," if it were actually present, and then, of necessity, would efficaciously manifest itself, would be "to live according to Christ;" [10] but the judgment has the force: *νεκρὸς εἶ*; i.e., not "nigh to death," [11] but instead of the indeed seeming, yet deficient, life, death is there. This, of course, is to be understood, not unconditionally, but as, according to what follows already in ver. 2, where the call to watch sounds forth, the being dead is represented as a sleep,[12] it is to be limited according to the spiritual meaning of the expressions *ζῇς* and *νεκρὸς εἶ*. Cf. Jas. ii. 17.

Ver. 2. *γίνου γρηγορῶν, become watchful.* This idea, Grot. interprets as indefinite: "beware of all sins." N. de Lyra, with an oblique reference: "watchful for the recognition of *defects* in thyself and thy flock." The Lord

[1] i. 13 sqq.

[2] Ver. 4 sq.

[3] This is not even altogether correct; the "white robes," iii. 4 sqq., do not have a special relation to the Lord's garment, i. 13.

[4] p. 572.

[5] De Wette: "*And* that thou hast the name." Cf. ver. 15.

[6] C. a Lap., Beng.

[7] Hengstenb.

[8] N. de Lyra, Zegar, Areth., Ewald, etc.

[9] De Wette, Ebrard. Cf. Herodot., vii., p. 485: *ἡ στρατηλασία — ὄνομα μὲν εἶχε, ὡς ὑπ' Ἀθήνας ἐλαύνει, κατίετο δὲ ἐς πᾶσαν τὴν Ἑλλάδα* ("The expedition had a name, as though directed against Athens, while it was really put in motion against all Greece").

[10] Grot.

[11] Eichh.

[12] Cf. Eph. v. 14.

demands the condition of spiritual watchfulness, which is opposed to indolence or security, as spiritual sleep or death, and is occupied in holy works, or a holy life.[1] Upon the essential identity of meaning in the two ideas of spiritual death and sleep, depends the connection of the command *γίνου γρηγορῶν* with the judgment *νεκρὸς εἰ*, and, again, with the admonition combined with the *γίνου γρηγορῶν*, viz., *καὶ στηρ. τ. λ. ἃ ἐμ. ἀποθανεῖν.* The last member of ver. 2, in its connection with *γάρ*, and its reference to the *works*,[2] is further explained from the proper conception of the one as well as of the other figurative designation. — *καὶ στήρισον τὰ λοιπὰ ἃ ἔμελλον ἀποθανεῖν.* Grot.: "See to it lest, by neglecting one charge, you become altogether flagitious." Thus the *τὰ λοιπὰ* appear as the blessings still remaining to their own souls,[3] "the virtues which still have remained with thee;" as Ewald says, who, by the explanation necessary with his recension of the text (*ἃ ἐμελλες ἀποθανεῖν*): "Strengthen the other things which, by dying, or keeping at leisure, thou art about to lose," commends that interpretation of the *τὰ λοιπὰ* the very least.[4] The neuter form by no means hinders us from referring the expression personally, i.e., to that part of the entire church which was already on the point of dying [5] This personal reference is supported as well by the idea of the *ἀποθανεῖν*,[6] as also of the *στήρισον*.[7] Only we must not understand "the rest" as meaning the laity,[8] under the presupposition that the angel of the church was the bishop, or the college of officers (*Vorsteher*); but the church contemplated in its unity and entirety, and, just because of the connection of its members, made in a mass responsible,[9] has, in its actual reality, on the one hand,[10] still vigorous living members, but also, on the other hand, and that, too, in a preponderating majority, those who could be preserved from the death already threatened only by strengthening on the part of the church again recovering, in its entirety, unto active, wakeful life. — The imp. *ἐμελλον* can be understood from the standpoint of the writer of the letter, just as the aor. *ἐμαρτύρησε* (1, 2);[11] but it is more probable, that, as in the immediately following *εὕρηκα*, the Lord himself, who speaks, looks back upon the investigation of the church previously undertaken by himself.[12] — *οὐ γὰρ εὕρηκα, κ.τ.λ.* The entire preceding admonition to the church, in mass, to be watchful, and to strengthen their members already dying by rising to a new, energetic life, is founded upon the reference to their defective works, in which it has become visible to the eyes of the Lord that they have been dead,[13] or sleeping. By *ἔργα*, as in ver. 1,[14] the entire activity of the inner life in its external activity and deportment is designated; it is not "good works" [15] that are meant, as though they were blamed only because they were

[1] Cf. Eph. v. 8–14.
[2] Cf. also ver. 4.
[3] Beng.
[4] Ew. ii.: "The other things on account of which thou wouldst die."
[5] Cf. Ezek. xxxiv. 4; 1 Cor. i. 26 sqq. So Andr., Areth., Calov., Vitr., Eichh., De Wette, Ebrard, etc.
[6] Cf. the *νεκρὸς εἶ*, ver. 1.
[7] Luke xxii. 32; 1 Thess. iii. 2, 13; 2 Thess. ii. 17; Rom. i. 11, xvi. 25; Jas. v. 8. Cf. Ps. li. 14, cxii. 8.
[8] Hengstenb.
[9] See on i. 20, ii. 15.
[10] Ver. 4.
[11] Ew.
[12] Cf. De Wette, also Volkm.
[13] Ver. 1.
[14] Cf. Matt. vii. 20 sqq.; Hengstenb.
[15] Ebrard.

not altogether *perfect* in their goodness. This idea, which in itself is not altogether incompatible with the tenor of the words, is much too weak for what precedes. It would first be necessary, with De Wette, to find a litotes: "Thy works are not less than perfect." But just in the simple precision, as the words proceed from the mouth of the Lord who judges his church, do they have their most forcible significance. The Lord who has tested[1] the works of the church according to the absolute norm[2] has found them not perfect, and therefore not corresponding to the measure applied to them.[3] Whether much or little be wanting for the required perfection of the works, is not to be asked: it is enough that the only and unconditionally prescribed measure is not reached. The express allusion to the absolute norm of all Christian morality is here the more forcible, as the church, according to human judgment, has the name that it lives.[4] Incorrect references, in Grot.: "You are inconstant; some things you do well, others ill;" and in Bengel: "However good the beginning was."

Ver. 3. From the reproach[5] follows[6] the admonition to repentance. The πῶς dare neither be expressly changed into a ποία,[7] nor be explained in a sense proceeding therefrom.[8] Castalio, correctly: "How thou wast instructed."[9] But it is not made prominent as to "how finely" the church received the doctrine, i.e., how well they began their life of faith;[10] there is also no allusion to the simplicity and purity of the apostolic mode of preaching.[11] In accord with the text, Ebrard explains: "The 'what' received by Sardis, it had maintained; but the 'how,' i.e., the manner in which it formerly had received and heard the 'what,' it had lost. Once it had received this with holy zeal of heart, but now only with the head." A description of the πῶς, as well in reference to the apostolic proclamation as the reception on the part of the hearers, is given by Paul (1 Thess. i. 5 sqq., ii. 1 sqq.; 1 Cor. ii. 1 sqq.). The manifestation of spirit and power which occurs with the preaching belongs to the right mode of hearing and receiving, as it is that mode which is efficacious unto sanctification; cf. Eph. iv. 20; Col. ii. 6. Thus the quickening and refreshal of the dead Christian life must actually be begun by the remembrance (μνημ.) of their original reception of the gospel whereby the new holy life was wrought. Besides, the two other points of the admonition, καὶ τήρει καὶ μετανόησον, and that, too, in immediate sequence of this, have their justification in the fact that the received divine truth, when it is maintained, has in itself the power to work true repentance, and thus evermore to cleanse, strengthen, and perfect the new life. — Not without artificial refinement does Bengel distinguish the ἐλήφας ("with the heart") from the ἤκουσας ("with the ear"), and then remarks on τήρει, "in order that your reception may not be in vain," and on μετανόησον, "in order that your hearing may not be in vain." Against this

[1] Cf. 1 John iv. 4.

[2] ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ μου; i.e., God being witness and judge. Grot., Vitr., De Wette, etc.

[3] Cf. Col. iv. 12; John xvi. 24, xvii. 13; 1 John i. 3; 2 John 12.

[4] Ver. 1. Hengstenb.

[5] Vv. 1, 2.

[6] μνημ. οὖν., ii. 5. Cf. ii. 16.

[7] Heinr.

[8] Grot.: "Doctrine such as thou hast received from the apostles."

[9] Cf. Aret., C. a Lap., Vitr., Beng., Ew., Ebrard.

[10] Beng. Cf. ver. 2.

[11] Vitr.

distinction between *εἰληφὰς* and *ἤκουσας* in fact, while it rather lies in the mode of statement,[1] the order of words already declares, which we would then expect to be reversed; the relation stated between the two ideas *τήρει* and *μετανόησον* is, in itself, arbitrary. The change from perf. to aor., in case such fine distinction were actually intended by the writer, can be explained only with Ew. ii.: The Holy Spirit appears to be still present in the church which had formerly received him, but the first hearing of the gospel lies simply in the past. With the perfect *εἰληφα* thus understood, the judgment on ver. 1 (*νεκρ. εἰ*) entirely harmonizes, because the latter is not absolute.[2] — In the second sentence of ver. 3, just as in ii. 5, 16, the threat follows as to a case where the requirement of the Lord is unfulfilled. Yet the *οὖν* peculiar to this passage does not indicate that the fruitlessness of the warning with respect to the bad condition of the church is presupposed.[3] Against this, the *ἐὰν* already declares, which sets forth the future as either thus or possibly otherwise.[4] But it refers either to the preceding admonition,[5] or to the accusation of ver. 2.[6] The latter seems the more correct as the expression *γοηγορήσης* connects with ver. 2. — *ἥξω ὡς κλέπτης.* Not only is this based, as to the expression, upon Matt. xxiv. 42 sqq., but the entire mode of contemplation, according to which the special judgment upon a particular congregation appears as a proof of the Lord's coming to final judgment,[7] is previously found in the eschatological discourse of the Lord, since there the special judgment upon Jerusalem appears combined with the final judgment at the *parousia.* — *οὐ μή.* Cf. Winer, p. 471. — *ποίαν ὥραν.* The acc. determinative of time[8] is not only Hebraic,[9] but also Greek."[10]

Ver. 4. The accusation, admonition to repentance, and threat thus far made to the entire church, are contrasted (*ἀλλ'*), by way of limitation, in regard to individual members, with the commendation that these have kept themselves free from the general sinfulness, and a corresponding promise; cf. ii. 4, 6. — *ἔχεις.* Because, as members, they belong to the entire church. Beng.: "These, even though indeed few, had not separated themselves; otherwise the angel of the church would not *have* them." — *ὀνόματα.* "Men designated by name;"[11] cf. xi. 13; Acts i. 15; Num. i. 2, 18, 20. Ewald. An allusion to the *ὄνομα ἔχεις*[12] is not to be acknowledged, because there the conception is entirely different from here. — *ἃ οὐκ ἐμόλυναν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτων.* The figurative expression is arbitrarily pressed if the *ἱμάτια* be interpreted as something special, whether as referring to the bodies as the clothing of the soul,[13] or the consciences,[14] or the righteousness of Christ put on by faith.[15] It is, further, without all foundation, when Ebrard, in the entire figurative expression, tries to find "a spiritual self-pollution arising from spiritual self-

[1] John xvii. 8; 1 Cor. xi. 23.
[2] See above on ver. 1; also cf. ver. 4 of this chapter.
[3] De Wette.
[4] Winer, pp. 273, 275.
[5] "As thou hast been so forcibly aroused and warned."
[6] "As thou so greatly needest repentance."
[7] Cf. ii. 5, 16.
[8] John iv. 52; Acts x. 3.
[9] De Wette, Ebrard.
[10] Cf. A. Matthiae, *Ausführl. Griech. Gramm.*, § 424; Winer, p. 215.
[11] Vatabl.
[12] Hengstenb., Ebrard.
[13] Areth., Zeger.
[14] Alcas., Tirin., Grot., Prie.
[15] Calov.

concupiscence," — "spiritual onanism." Too much also is made of the figure if the presupposed purity of the garment be derived from baptism by a mistaken appeal to vii. 14.[1] N. de Lyra already correctly abides by the general idea whereby the "being defiled" occurs by means of sin,[2] in which sense, of course, it may be said that the *ἱμάτια* are the life itself, and actions of works,[3] or profession and life.[4] We have not to ask throughout as to what is properly meant by the garment; the entire figure of the defiling of the clothing is a designation of the impure and unholy life and conversation.[5] To the commendatory recognition, corresponds also the promise of the reward: *καὶ περιπατήσουσιν μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐν λευκοῖς* (viz., *ἱματίοις*). Incorrectly, Aretius, who identifies the "white garments" with the undefiled garments: "They will persevere in the pursuit of good works." The white garments, with their bright "hue of victory,"[6] are peculiar to those in heaven.[7] They who, in their earthly lives, have kept their garments undefiled will walk with Christ[8] in white garments, since, thus adorned, they will live in "the state of immortal glory,"[9] before the throne of God and of the Lamb, in the full and blessed enjoyment of his fellowship. [See Note XXXV., p. 183.] But the more definitely the promise *περιπ. μετ' ἐμ. ἐν λευκοῖς* stands with respect to the testimony of acknowledgment *ἃ οὐκ ἐμόλυναν τ. ἱμ. αὐτ.*, — especially as marked by the addition *ὅτι ἄξιοί εἰσιν*, — the more remote appears the side reference to the heavenly priesthood of the blessed which is to be indicated by the white garments, especially if, in connection therewith, the Jewish custom be thought of, that the priests examined before the Sanhedrim were clad in black or white garments, according as any defect were or were not found in their bodies.[10] — *ὅτι ἄξιοί εἰσιν.* The foundation is entirely in the sense presented in xvi. 6.[11] As, there, they who have shed blood must drink blood, so here, white garments are promised the undefiled because they are worthy of this. The idea, however, lying at the basis of the remuneration,[12] leads also, in this passage, where the discourse is concerning reward, not to the Roman-Catholic idea of a merit, because, as Calov. correctly says, in substance, "Christ alone, by faith, renders them worthy." Life itself,[13] with all its powers exercised by those clad in white robes, is a free gift of the grace of the Lord; a *meritum* could be spoken of only when man, by his own powers, keeps himself undefiled. Thus, however, John designates only "a congruency between the acts and the honor rendered to them, even though the honor exceed the act."[14]

Ver. 5. *ὁ νικῶν.* This designation recurring uniformly at the close of every epistle, and therefore not of a conception to be united by means of *οὕτως*, results from what precedes. Here is meant the energetic manifestation of the life received in faith, which cannot occur without a victorious

[1] Beda, Rib., C. a Lap.; cf. Zeger, Hengstenb.
[2] Cf. also Ew., De Wette, Bleek, Stern.
[3] Aretius.
[4] Vitr.
[5] Cf. ver. 2.
[6] Beng.
[7] Ver. 5, vi. 11, vi. 9, xix. 8.
[8] *μετ' ἐμοῦ.* Cf. Luke xxiii. 43; John xvii. 24.
[9] N. de Lyra.
[10] Schöttgen, *in loc.* Cf. Vitr., Züll.
[11] Cf. xiv. 13; Rom. ii. 6; 2 Cor. v. 10.
[12] De Wette. Cf. xvi. 5, the *δίκαιος εἶ.*
[13] Cf. ver. 1.
[14] Grot. Cf. Vitr. (Cf. Luke xx. 35.)

conflict with the world and one's own flesh. An express pointing backward to what precedes is made by the οὕτως, which makes the promise here bestowed upon the victor (οὗτ. περιβ. ἐν. ἱμ. λευκ.)[1] appear to coincide with that which (ver. 4) was given to the one whose garments were not defiled.[2] — The second promise, καὶ οὐ μὴ ἐξαλείψω τὸ ὄν. αὐτ. ἐκ τ. βίβλ. τ. ζωῆς, has likewise reference to what precedes, because not only he who has the name that he lives, but he who besides actually lives,[3] can remain written in the book of life. The figure of the book of life[4] is not derived from "the genealogical records of the priests,"[5] but from lists such as, e.g., the magistrates kept, and from which the names of deceased citizens were stricken.[6] A man is not written in the book of life[7] when he becomes participant of new spiritual life (cf. ver. 1), when he receives the quickening truth (cf. ver. 3), or becomes a child and heir of God through faith in Christ.[8] This ethical accommodation referring to the temporal conduct of man is actually not present. In the book of life, which according to its nature is eternal, there is from the beginning of the world[9] God's attestation of the eternal salvation which those written in the book are to experience. The rejection of what is deterministic, and the maintenance of what is ethical, lie in the further declaration whereby the of course not to be realized possibility of the erasure of the name from the book of life is stated. Yet it is in reality by the free conduct of the believer, that his name may remain in the book. The name of the victor remaining faithful and walking worthily, will not be blotted out of the book of life; the victor, therefore, will receive hereafter the heavenly gracious reward of eternal life with the Lord, while those not written in the book of life will be rejected by the Lord[10] [See Note XXXVI., p. 183.] Still, in a third way, is the promise given the victor expressed: καὶ ὁμολογήσω, κ.τ.λ. This stands, of course, as the recurrence of τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ already signifies, in connection with what immediately precedes, yet not as Eichh. states: "And as often as recitation is made from it, I will declare his praises." With the idea of the book of life, that of the frequent reading of the name is not in itself consistent;[11] and the ὁμολ., κ.τ.λ., can only[12] have the sense that the Lord, speaking as Judge, expressly testifies that he knows the name of the victor (written in the book of life) as the name of one of his own, and, therefore, that the one named belongs to him, the Lord, and on this account shall have part in the glory of his kingdom.[13]

Vv. 7–13. The epistle to the church at Philadelphia. — Philadelphia in Lydia, named after its founder, King Attalus Philadelphus of Pergamos, lay thirteen hours south-east of Sardis, likewise at the foot of Tmolus. The present Alah Schahr, a not entirely unimportant town, inhabited by Turks and Christians, contains many ruins of ancient Phil. — Of the Christian

[1] Cf. on the ἐν, Matt. xi. 8. Winer, p. 361.
[2] Cf. also Ebrard, Volkm.
[3] Cf. ver. 1.
[4] xiii. 8, xvii. 8, xx. 12, 15, xxi. 27. Cf. Ps. lxix. 29; Isa. iv. 3; Exod. xxxii. 32 sqq.; Dan. xii. 1; Phil. iv. 3; Luke x. 20.
[5] Vitr., Schöttgen. See on ver. 4.
[6] Cf. Wetst.
[7] As was said here in the 2d ed. So also Kliefoth: cf., on the other hand, Gebhardt, p. 154.
[8] "In baptism." C. a Lap.
[9] xiii. 8, and often.
[10] Cf. xx. 15, xxi. 27.
[11] Cf. also xx. 12 sqq.
[12] Cf. Matt. x. 32; Luke xii. 8.
[13] Cf. xxi. 27, xix. 9; Matt. vii. 23, xxv. 12.

church at Phil., this Apoc. epistle contains the first trace. A Christian prophetess, Ammia, was mentioned at Phila.[1] According to the Apostolic Constitutions, vii. 46, Peter installed there the first bishop, Demetrius. Many expositors[2] have regarded a bishop Quadratus[3] the receiver of the Apocalyptic message. The apologist Quadratus was bishop of Athens.[4] — The church, like that at Smyrna (ii. 9), was exposed to the hostility of the Jews; but, although by no means of imposing importance on account of its extent or other external relations, it had confessed the name of the Lord Jesus with patient fidelity (ver. 8): among the promises imparted to this church is, accordingly, that also of true victory over the hostile Jews, who in all humility were to seek a share in the salvation discerned in the church (ver. 9). This relation to Judaism is testified also by the entire mode of conception and expression of the epistle, which with especial definiteness supports itself upon the divine foundation of the O. T., so that, in opposition to false Judaism as the synagogue of Satan, the Church of Jesus Christ appears the more distinctly as the true people of God.

Ver. 7. The designation of the Lord is derived, of course, not immediately and in its particular details from i. 12 sq., but is formed with reference to the contents of the epistle that follows;[5] yet the essential meaning of the predicates here used is no other than that expressed in the entire description, i. 12 sq., as only the peculiar mode of statement is conditioned by the opposition to false Judaism. Christ, rejected and traduced by the "synagogue of Satan," is nevertheless the absolutely Holy One, the true Messiah, and the Lord of the earth. — *ὁ ἅγιος*. Incorrectly Eichh., Heinr.: "A divine ambassador." So, too, the conception of holiness is improperly obtained by Calov.: "Christ, the Holy One, as the model of the holiness of bishops;" by Vitringa:[6] "Christ the Holy One of Israel,[7] as the antitype of the high priest, the prefect of the heavenly sanctuary;" by Ewald:[8] "Who, on account of his very holiness, avenges the injury inflicted upon Christians by proud Jews."[9] Too indefinite is Ebrard's reference: "To whom every thing ungodly, even what is most deceptive, is an offence." The *ὁ ἅγιος*, as well as the *ὁ ἀληθινός*, receives its living relation only in connection with the *ὁ ἔχων τ. κλεῖν*, and with respect to the epistle which follows. Incorrect are all interpretations of the *ὁ ἀληθινός* depending upon the presumption that *ἀληθινός* is synonymous with *ἀψευδής* or *ἀληθής*,[10] while *ἀληθινός* means "genuine, with its idea corresponding to its name." So the Lord calls himself (iii. 14) *ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστὸς καὶ ἀληθινός*, because he is a trustworthy witness, and, just on that account, such an one as actually merits this name. Cf. vi. 10, xix. 2, 9, xvi. 7; John xvii. 3;[11] 1 John v. 20 sqq.; Heb. ix. 24. Passages also like xxi. 5, xxii. 6, xv. 3, Heb. x. 22, are to be explained according to this idea. In-

[1] Cf. Euseb., *H. E.*, v. 17.
[2] Cf. N. de Lyra.
[3] Perhaps according to Eusebius as above. Cf. iii. 37.
[4] *H. E.*, iv. 123.
[5] Cf. Ebrard. [6] Cf. also Züll.
[7] Isa. vi.
[8] Cf. also De Wette, Stern, etc.
[9] A comparison may here be made with vi. 10, where, however, this energetic expression of holiness in judicial righteousness is explicitly marked.
[10] Cf., on the other hand, Meyer on John vii. 28; Trench, *Synonyms of the N. T.*, Cambr., 1854, § 8.
[11] Cf. Isa. lxv. 16, LXX.

correct, therefore, is the exposition of Vitr.: "Christ as the Mediator of divine truth, as the wearer of the true Urim and Thummim." Calov.: "Because he wishes that they who have received it of him guard the word of truth." Ewald, Stern, etc.: "His promises in reference to the reward are fulfilled to the faithful." Ebrard: "Who does not join in the falsehoods of those who malign Philadelphia, but on his part (ver. 10) will bring the truth to light." The proper meaning of the expression *ἀληθινός* has been correctly apprehended by Alcas., C. a Lap., and Grot.,[1] but has been misapplied by them, as they have combined the two predicates *ὁ ἅγιος, ὁ ἀληθινός*: "Who has true and perfect holiness — the superlative of holiness." But the *ὁ ἀληθ.* has in itself[2] an important meaning. Hengstenb. has given the correct interpretation, when in reference to ver. 9 he mentions the calumnies of the Jews, attested by Justin Martyr, who wished to see in the Lord only "the one hanged," and therefore a false Messiah. As opposed to such calumniating Jews, Christ is designated as the absolutely holy, and connected therewith as the true, i.e., the actual and genuine Messiah, heir and Lord of the truly abiding theocracy (*ὁ ἐχ. τ. κλ. τ. Δαυίδ, κ τ.λ.*). In a similar sense, the apostles in their discourses to the Jews have vindicated the holiness, and, accordingly, the true Messiahship and Sonship of God of the Crucified.[3] — *ὁ ἔχων τὴν κλεῖν Δαυίδ, κ.τ.λ.* Incorrect is the conjecture *τ. κλεῖν Τάφεθ* (Τώφεθ), made by Wolf, in consideration of i. 18.[4] Without any ground, N. de Lyra explains[5] the key of David, by appealing to Luke xi. 52, xxiv. 32, as "the power to open the understanding of the Scriptures," and, accordingly, the words *ὁ ἀνοίγων, κ.τ.λ.*: "No one can hinder those from understanding the Scriptures whom he wishes to instruct, nor can any one understand them unless he unlock them." So on ver. 9. In like manner is the explanation of Alcasar solved, concerning the cross of Christ as "the instrument of omnipotence." With entire correctness is "the key of David," and the succeeding description of its management, interpreted by almost all expositors in general, of the Lord's own supreme power[6] in the kingdom of God. The expression contains an allusion to Isa. xxii. 22,[7] but also[8] a significant modification of that passage, since the Lord here appears as the one who has not the key of the house of David,[9] but the "key of David." Consequently the Lord is represented not as a second Eliakim, as his antitype, which is also in itself inapposite, but he appears in a series with King David himself, as heir of his royal house and kingdom.[10] The key of David belongs to one who, as David himself, has a peculiar right, and is Lord[11] in his royal house, — not in the temple,[12] — and accordingly in the entire kingdom of David. But this is applicable to Christ as the new David[13] unconditionally, because the ancient David, with

[1] Cf. Ew. ii.

[2] Cf. xix. 11.

[3] Acts iii. 14, iv. 27, 30, vii. 52, xiii. 35. Cf. John xiii. 19.

[4] Cf. 2 Kings xxiii. 10.

[5] Cf. also Primas, Vieg., Zeger.

[6] Cf. Matt. xxviii. 18.

[7] Where it is said concerning Eliakim: *δώσω αὐτῷ τὴν κλεῖδα οἴκου Δαυὶδ ἐπὶ τῷ ὤμῳ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀνοίξει καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ὁ ἀποκλείων, καὶ κλείσει καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ὁ ἀνοίγων.*

[8] Hengstenb., Ebrard.

[9] As Grot., Calov., Ewald, De Wette, etc., here explain. [10] Cf. v. 5, xxii. 16; Luke i. 32.

[11] Cf. also Ahrens, a. a. O. S. 13.

[12] Cf. C. a Lap., Vitr., Züll., etc.

[13] Cf. Hos. iii. 5; Jer. xxx. 9; Ezek. xxxiv. 23 sqq., xxxvii. 24 sqq.

his theocratic kingdom, was only a prophetic type of the Lord and his eternal kingdom. Just as in Acts ii. 29 sqq., xiii. 22 sqq., 33 sqq., this is here applied to unbelieving Jews. — *ὁ ἀνοίγων, κ.τ.λ.* The construction in the second member is Hebraic,[1] as the participle makes a transition to the finite tense,[2] without on that account requiring a *ὃς* to be supplied before *κλείει*.[3] The entire thought of *ὁ ἀνοίγων — οὐδεὶς ἀνοίγει* depends upon the predicate *ὁ ἔχων τ. κλεῖν τ. Δ.*, and is an explanation thereof. But the idea is defined too narrowly, on the one hand, by those who, by a comparison of Matt. xvi. 19, regard the power of Christ here as being that to forgive sins, and thus to receive into the kingdom of heaven,[4] and, on the other, by those who derive from ver. 8 (*θύραν ἀνεῳγμ.*) a limitation to ver. 7, and thence infer that Christ opens the opportunity for entrance into his kingdom;[5] while, on the contrary, ver. 8 makes prominent only a special point of what in ver. 7 is said far more generally, and applied on the other side (*καὶ κλείει, κ.τ.λ.*). Not once is the distinction of the earthly and heavenly kingdoms to be marked, but the latter is to be regarded in its indivisible completeness, as Christ the Lord and King of the realm admits therein or excludes therefrom.[6] The supreme power of Christ, belonging to him as the true Messiah, is declared of him entirely in connection with all preceding predicates, and the succeeding epistles.[7] As an essential part thereto, there belongs especially the irrevocable and inevitable twofold decision in the final judgment. [See Note XXXVII., p 183.]

Ver. 8. With *οἰδά σου τὰ ἔργα* we are not to immediately combine the *ὅτι μικρ. ἐχ. δυν.* as though the latter words[8] contain an explicit statement of the *ἔργα*;[9] for, in a formal respect, it is impracticable to regard the entire clause *ἰδού — ἀυτήν* as a parenthesis; and, as to the subject, the point expressed in the assumed parenthesis belongs already also in the idea of *τὰ ἔργα*. But[10] by the words *οἰδά σου τὰ ἔργα*, the Lord testifies chiefly, without any further determination, that every thing is known to him with which the church in its present life is engaged.[11] To the church at Philadelphia this is a word of commendation and consolation. This results from the words of the Lord which immediately follow: *ἰδού, δέδωκα, κ.τ.λ.*, in which the thought is expressed that the fidelity maintained by the church, notwithstanding its external helplessness, depends not only upon a gracious gift of the Lord, but also serves the purpose, — and that, too, again through his government, — that through the faithful church the Lord's kingdom is increased. This sense depends chiefly upon the correct interpretation of the figurative expression *δεδ. ἐν. σ. θύραν ἀνεῳγμένην, κ.τ.λ.* The door is opened, viz., either in order that the church itself may enter,[12] or in order that by means of the church others may enter.[13] According to the former idea, N. de Lyra,[14] etc., explain: "a door is opened for understanding the Scriptures." Arethas: *τὴν εἴσοδον πρὸς ἀπολαυσιν* ("entrance to fruition"). Bengel: "Entrance into

[1] De Wette.
[2] Cf., e.g., Am. v. 8.
[3] Beng.
[4] C. a Lap., Vitr., Eichh., etc.
[5] Ew.; cf. De Wette, Ebrard.
[6] Cf. Calov., Stern, Hengstenb., etc.
[7] Especially ver. 9. Cf. ver. 12.
[8] Cf. the *ὅτι*, ver. 1.
[9] Bengel. Cf. also Ewald, De Wette.
[10] Cf. Ebrard.
[11] Cf. ver. 1, ii. 2.
[12] Cf. Acts xiv. 27.
[13] Cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 9; 2 Cor. ii. 12; Col. iv. 3.
[14] Cf. ver. 7.

the joy of thy Lord, and meanwhile into unhindered progress in all good." Eichh.: "Entrance to me lies open to thee;" in the shallow sense: "I desire well for thee."[1] Züllig: "Entrance into the temple." Hengstenb.:[2] "Entrance to the house of David, or the kingdom of God." According to another mode of representation, it is explained by Andr., Rib., Alcas., C. a Lap., Stern, Grot., Calov., Vitr., Wolf, Ew., De Wette, Ebrard, etc., who think of the favorable and successful opportunity for the missionary activity of the church. A decision in favor of this explanation, and that, too, in reference, not to heathen,[3] but to Jews who are to be won by the fidelity of the believing church, is made by the connection with ver. 9. A special intimation of the connection of *δέδωκα*, *διδῶ*, and *ποιήσω*, lies even in the threefold *ἰδού*.[4] A declaration concerning the entrance of the church into heavenly joy, of which alone, according to the first mode of statement, we can think, could scarcely be made at the very beginning of the epistle. The statement correctly understood stands, consequently, in close connection with the designation of the Lord, ver. 7, *ὁ ἔχων τ. κλεῖν Δ., κ.τ.λ.*, and emphasizes a special point, corresponding to the further contents of the epistle, of the supreme power in reference to his kingdom, to be ascribed from ver. 7, in unlimited universality, to the Lord; i.e., Christ expressly, and with visible results, attests his Davidic power of the keys in this, that he has opened a door before his faithful and steadfast church, through which a multitude of still unbelieving Jews are to enter. For the words *ἰδού, ποιήσω αὐτοὺς, ἵνα ἥξουσι, κ.τ.λ.*, ver. 9, are in substance an exposition of *ἰδού, δεδ. ἐν. σ. θύραν ἀνεῳγμένην, κ.τ.λ.*, as they state the actual, but yet future, consequence of an opportunity already given (*δέδωκα*, perf.). That Christ can say of himself *δεδωκα* and *ποιήσω*, depends upon the fact that it is he who has the key of David. — *ἐνώπιόν σου*. To be distinguished from *σοι*[5] only in mode of contemplation, but not[6] in substance. The Hebraic coloring of the formula[7] corresponds well with the statement in this passage, and the style of the Apoc. in general. — The demonstrative *αὐτήν*, brought in after the relative *ἣν*, is also Hebraistic. — *ὅτι*. Incorrectly, Vitr.: "Even though." Rather is that which immediately precedes based upon *ὅτι μικρὰν ἔχεις δύναμιν καὶ ἐτήρησας, κ.τ.λ.* The "little strength," viz., of the church, cannot be explained by the lack of miraculous gifts,[8] but refers to the smallness of the church,[9] which must also be regarded in destitution when compared with the richer Jews.[10] As now with the *μικρὰν ἔχεις δύναμιν*, the *καὶ ἐτήρησας* is combined, these two members of the sentence externally united by the mere *καὶ* show themselves to have a definite inner relation: "and (yet) hast kept," etc.[11] Concerning the subject itself, cf. ver. 10, ii. 3. The church, therefore, already had had opportunity, as the aor. forms *ἐτήρησας* and *ἠρνήσω* indicate, to confess the

[1] Cf. also Heinr.
[2] Bleek.
[3] Cf. C. a Lap.
[4] Cf. also Bengel.
[5] Cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 9; 2 Cor. ii. 12; Col. iv. 3.
[6] Vitr.
[7] לְפָנֶיךָ
[8] N. de Lyra: "Because I have not given thee, like many other bishops of this time, the gift of miracles, I have recompensed thee with excellent knowledge of the Scriptures."
[9] Grot., Wetst., Eichh., De Wette, Ebrard, etc.
[10] Hengstenb.
[11] De Wette, etc.

Lord's name in opposition to unbelievers, — apparently Jews and heathen. Therefore, because (ὅτι) the church has done this, although of insignificant outward power, the Lord has given it an "open door," the meaning of which is stated in ver. 9. [See Note XXXVIII., p. 183.] Thus the idea is advanced, that the faithful, steadfast confession of the church, indicated especially in τὰ ἔργα, is the cause whose effect and reward, through the Lord's disposing (δέδωκα, cf. διδῶ, ποιήσω, ver. 9), is to be the conversion of a number of his enemies. Faithful confessing has itself opened the door, but of course only because the Lord had given believers power for testimony. Thus the clause ἰδού, δέδωκα, κ.τ.λ., stands upon the idea τὰ ἔργα, and the whole (ver. 8) upon the designation of the Lord, ver. 7.

Ver. 9. διδῶ, not "I will suffer," as Wolf recommends. Hengstenb. also incorrectly: "I give *thee*, or the Christian Church, and therefore also thee." The διδῶ, to which as object the partitive gen. τῶν λεγόντων belongs,[1] is again taken up in the formally (fut.) more definitely fixed ποιήσω, as then the αὐτούς also recurs to the just-mentioned object τῶν λεγόντων, κ.τ.λ. The words ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς τοῦ σατανᾶ designate the persons meant, with respect to their origin. They are not false Christians,[2] but[3] Jews who just because of their enmity to the true Messiah (ver. 7) are not true Jews, but the synagogue of Satan. Yet also in that the Lord brings some from this synagogue, and causes them to come humbly and believingly to his church, he shows that he is the one who has the key of David. — ποιήσω αὐτοὺς, ἵνα ἥξουσι, κ.τ.λ Concerning the attraction αὐτούς, cf. Winer, p. 282; concerning ἵνα, also John xi. 37, after ποιεῖν, with the ind. fut., cf. vi. 11, xxii. 14; 1 Pet. iii. 1; Mark iii. 2; Winer, p. 272. — The ποιήσω marks the still entirely future result which the Lord will work;[4] the inner relation to διδῶ and δέδωκα (ver. 8) is this, that the δέδωκα (perf.) extends to the present, and continues in its operation, while the διδῶ is present in its work, and will proceed to the ποιήσω. The opened door still stands open, and the Lord will work that a multitude of still unbelieving Jews may enter. — Both the ἥξουσι and the προσκυνήσουσι ἐνώπιον τῶν ποδῶν σου are explained in connection with the O. T. prophecies of the conversion of the heathen, by the fact that for unbelieving Jews, as they have just been described, the Church of Jesus Christ, viz., of him who has the key of David, ver 7, is the true Zion, in which they, no less than the heathen, must seek and will find the truth of God, and the fellowship of salvation. Thus, so far as the expressions are concerned, such prophecies as Isa. lx. 14, xlix. 23, ii. 3; Ps. lxxii. 9; Zach. viii. 20 sqq., are in full harmony with what is here stated. The προσκυνεῖν, κ.τ.λ., especially as an expression of homage,[5] has its complete justification in the fact that the Church of Jesus Christ stands there as beloved of the Lord (κ. γνῶσιν, ὅτι ἠγάπησά σε), and as the mediator of the divine salvation. Yet the Catholic interpretation without any ground has: "The highest devotion of believers, and reverence and submission to the Church and *its prelates*, are signified. For this adoration proceeds from the apprehension of *an excellence of prelates that is more than*

[1] Cf. ii. 17. Winer, p. 490.
[2] Vitr.
[3] Cf. ii. 9.
[4] Viz., ἥξουσ., κ.τ.λ.
[5] Cf. Gen. xxiii. 7, etc. Ew., Ebrard, etc.

human, and less than divine."[1] — καὶ γνῶσιν, ὅτι ἠγάπησά σε. On the one hand, the aorist form ἠγάπησα,[2] and on the other the connection and allusion to ver. 7, furnish the reference to the definite proof of the Lord's love, in that he has died for his Church. Just this must the unbelieving Jews acknowledge who now still reject and blaspheme the Lord as a crucified evil-doer.[3] Incorrect reference of the ἠγαπ. in N. de Lyra: "By advancing thee not only to the catholic faith, but also to the episcopal dignity;" in Ew., to ver. 10, or[4] to Isa. lxiii. 4, lxix. 27. De Wette too, indefinitely: "That I have acknowledged thee as a faithful church, and furnished thee with my gifts and power."

Ver. 10. ὅτι ἐτήρησας — κἀγώ σε τηρήσω. The form of the antanaclasis[5] corresponds with the inner relation between the performance of the church, and the reward on the Lord's part; but even the performance of the church depends entirely upon the Lord's grace, as the λόγος τ. ὑπομ. itself, which the church has kept, is full of divine power, nourishes and supports the faith, fidelity, patience, and hope of the church, and thus qualifies the same for victory. — τὸν λόγον τῆς ὑπομονῆς μου. The gen. ὑπομονῆς designates the λόγος according to its peculiar nature, as it depends upon its contents;[6] the pronoun μου belongs not only to τῆς ὑπομ.,[7] but[8] to the whole conception τ. λογ. τ. ὑπομ.[9] The form of statement in i. 9 is therefore, at all events, a different one.[10] Consequently τ. λογ. τ. ὑπομ. μου cannot be: "the word concerning Christ's patience, concerning the sufferings of Christ patiently endured for us," or "the word of constancy in Christ's faith;"[11] or "the word which makes its demands partly according to its contents and spirit,[12] and partly by virtue of the duty of confession and steadfastness in following, as *it belongs to me* and mine;"[13] also not: "my patience, i e., the specifically Christian, expressly required by the Lord himself, and enjoined as a preservative against the judgments threatened against the world."[14] The vacillation and juncture of different ideas by all interpreters who wish to refer the μου only to τ. ὑπομ. reveals the unnaturalness of the combination. The λόγος τῆς ὑπομονῆς of the Lord dare not, however, be explained: "the word which among other commandments contains that of patience also," an explanation which is incorrectly ascribed to Grot., who, as many others vacillating concerning the relation of the μου, says at one time: "My precept concerning patience," and then, again, that the patience of Christ signifies "that which

[1] C. a Lap.

[2] Cf. John xiii. 1; Eph. v. 25; Gal. ii. 20; also John iii. 16; 1 John iv. 10, 11.

[3] Cf. ii. 9; Acts xiii. 45.

[4] Ew. ii.

[5] Beng., etc.

[6] Cf. Winer, p. 222.

[7] Calov., Ew., De Wette, Hengstenb., etc.

[8] Cf. xiii. 3; Col. i. 13; Heb. i. 3.

[9] Winer, p. 222. Obscure: Grot., Vitr., Eichh., Heinr., Ebrard.

[10] Against Hengstenb., etc.

[11] Calov.

[12] As the word of the cross (1 Cor. i. 18).

[13] Vitr., who also paraphrases: "They preserved *the word* of the *Lord's patience;* i.e., the word of the Lord, which is a word of patience, because no one can with constancy profess the doctrine of the gospel, unless, at the same time, he fortify himself to bear with patience the afflictions accompanying the profession of Christianity." All Christians must bear the cross of Christ (Matt. xvi. 24), i.e., θλῖψις; but θλῖψις works ὑπομονήν (Rom. v. 3), so that the λογ. τῆς ὑπομον. is nothing else than the λογ. τοῦ σταυροῦ (1 Cor. i. 18).

[14] Luke xxi. 19, viii. 15; Matt. x. 22, xxiv. 13. Hengstenb.

Christ has enjoined." The whole word of God as a word of patience rather appears to be the view of the Revelation in general, and of our epistle in particular, because with respect to troubles unavoidable to believers it gives and demands steadfast, faithful, and hopeful patience, i.e., the virtue which alone can lead us from all troubles to glory.[1] With respect to the already present and still future troubles, every thing to the believer turns upon the fact that he "overcomes." This he can attain only through the *ὑπομονή*, to which the word of his Lord points him. Thus the writer of the Apoc. can from his point of vision regard the whole word of Christ as a *λόγον τῆς ὑπομονῆς* with the same right as, e.g., Paul, the preacher of righteousness, alone by faith in the Crucified, represents the whole gospel as the *λόγος τοῦ σταυροῦ*.[2] — In the words *κἀγώ σε τηρήσω ἐκ τῆς ὥρας, κ.τ.λ.*, the church at Philadelphia is not promised that it shall be preserved from the hour of trial, i.e., that it shall not meet with sufferings full of trial,[3] but in accordance with the presentation of the Apoc., that the troubles before the coming of the Lord will befall all believers, who of course are sealed,[4] lest by the temptation in the troubles they may fall;[5] and in accordance with the corresponding expression *τηρ. ἐκ*,[6] in distinction from *τηρ. ἀπό*,[7] the church at Philadelphia, since it has already maintained victorious patience, is also to be *delivered* by his *confirming* grace from the universal distress impending before the coming of the Lord.[8] — The *ὥρα τοῦ πειρασμοῦ, κ.τ.λ.*, i.e., the precise period wherein the temptation is to occur,[9] refers to no persecution whatever proceeding from the Roman emperors, — neither that of Nero,[10] nor some one after Domitian,[11] possibly under Trajan,[12] — also not, as Primas and Beda[13] arbitrarily agree, to sufferings occasioned by antichrist; but the idea, here not more minutely defined, is to be referred, according to the further development of the Apoc., to all the afflictions which, before the personal coming of the Lord,[14] are to burst upon believers;[15] the punishments impending by God's wrath only over unbelievers before the appearing of the Lord are not meant.[16] — The idea of the *πειρασμός* and *πειράσαι*[17] has its justification because, on the one hand, to believers the danger of a fall into such suffering is present,[18] — and hence there go with it the promise *σὲ τηρήσω*, the command *κράτει, κ.τ.λ.*, ver. 11, and the pledge to the victor, ver. 12, — but, on the other hand, to unbelievers such suffering must actually be a temptation,[19] and that, too, of such kind as that because of their impenitent unbelief they will ever fall by it the deeper, and

[1] Cf. i. 9; Matt. xxiv. 13.

[2] Cf. 1 Cor. i. 17 sqq., ii. 1.

[3] Whereby either the church at Philadelphia alone, as constituting a special exception (Beng., Eichh., Ebrard), or certain afflictions (chs. vi., viii.), in whose presence *all* believers are to remain approved (vii. 3 sqq.; De Wette; cf. Ewald, Züll.), are regarded.

[4] The case is different in ix. 3, where they who are sealed are not touched by a plague immediately coming *from the abyss*.

[5] Cf. vii. 3, 14; Matt. xxiv. 22, 24.

[6] John xvii. 15. Cf. Apoc. vii. 14: *ἐρχ. ἐκ τ. θλίψ.*

[7] Jas. i. 27; Prov. vii. 5. Cf. 2 Thess. iii. 3.

[8] Cf. Vitr., Hengstenb., Ew. ii., Volkm.

[9] Cf. xiv. 7, 15.

[10] Grot.

[11] N. de Lyra.

[12] Alcas., Parcus, etc.

[13] Cf. Andr., Areth.

[14] Cf. immediately afterwards ver. 11: *ἔρχομαι ταχύ*.

[15] Cf. ch. vi.

[16] Cf. ch. xvi.

[17] Cf. ii. 10.

[18] Cf. Matt. xxiv. 22, 24.

[19] Cf. Deut. iv. 34, vii. 19, xxix. 3.

their hostility to what is holy be always the more revealed by despair and blasphemy.[1] — *ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκουμένης ὅλης*. The remark that hereby the Roman empire is designated[2] is correct only so far as in John's historical horizon the whole world appears comprehended in the Roman empire. Yet by this (erroneous) limitation, the prophetic truth remains untouched, that the hour of temptation is to come to the actual *οἰκουμένη ὅλη*, as certainly as the Lord himself is to appear as absolutely Judge of all. — *πειράσαι τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*. Those dwelling on the earth are, according to the constant mode of expression in the Apoc.,[3] the mass of men, in contradistinction to believers redeemed from all nations and tongues.[4] The *πειράσαι* refers to them in so far only as they are *not* kept (*σὲ τηρήσω*).

Ver. 11. *ἔρχομαι ταχύ*. The message resounding throughout the entire Revelation,[5] which proclaims judgment against enemies and the impenitent,[6] serves faithful believers[7] as a consolation and encouragement,[8] and here is made especially prominent by the more explicit admonition to receive the crown[9] from the hand of the coming Lord: *κράτει ὃ ἔχεις, κ.τ.λ.* What the church *has*, must be that because of which it is to receive the crown, if it hold the same fast.[10] Thus, e.g., the church at Ephesus "has" this, that it hates the works of the Nicolaitans.[11] What the church at Phila. has, is to be discerned from vv. 8–10; viz., this, that in trouble they had patiently kept the word of the Lord, and had not denied his name. Holding fast is by perseverance unto the end;[12] but the victor's crown of eternal life — the hope laid up[13] — would be taken away,[14] if the church would not hold fast to what it had, but in the impending temptation would waver and apostatize. Hence the Lord who pledges his gracious preservation (ver. 10) admonishes to faithful holding fast. Inconsistent with the context is the definition of the *ὃ ἔχεις* by N. de Lyra as "grace given thee;" and by Ew.,[15] "the ornament of thy virtues." Better, C. a Lap.:[16] "faith and patience." — From the general mode of expression *ἵνα μηδεὶς λάβῃ*, the idea must not be pressed that another could retain for himself the crown snatched from the church.[17] This possibly would have been expressed by *ἄλλος*.[18] But the idea itself is impossible.[19]

Ver. 12. As in all the epistles, so here, the concluding promise to the "victor" (cf. ver. 11) proceeds to the time of eternal glory after the coming of the Lord. This is, besides, especially indicated here by the expression *τ. καιν. Ἱερους., κ.τ.λ.* The incorrect reference to "the Church militant,"[20] or "the Church militant *and* triumphant,"[21] causes the most perverted inter-

[1] ix. 20. Cf. xvi. 11, 21; Hengstenb.
[2] Cf. Luke ii. 1; Grot., Vitr., Stern, etc.
[3] vi. 10, xi. 10, xiii. 8, 14, etc. Cf. Acts iv. 26.
[4] Cf. v. 9.
[5] xxii. 7, 12, 20. Cf. i. 1, 3.
[6] Cf., e.g., ii. 5, 16.
[7] Cf. ii. 25.
[8] De Wette.
[9] Cf. ii. 10.
[10] Cf. ii. 1, 25.
[11] ii. 6.
[12] Cf. Matt. xxiv. 13.
[13] 2 Tim. i. 12, iv. 8.
[14] *λάβῃ*. Cf. vi. 4; De Wette.
[15] Cf. Vitr., Wolf, etc.
[16] Cf. Grot., etc.
[17] Grot., Züll.
[18] De Wette.
[19] Cf. already Calov.
[20] N. de Lyra, Areth., Grot., Wetst., Schöttg., etc.
[21] Vitr., C. a Lap., Stern, etc.

pretations of individual points. Thus N. de Lyra interprets, by understanding ἐν τ. ναῷ τ. θ. μ. and τ. πόλεως τ. θ. μ. of the Church militant, and the ποιήσω αὐτ. στύλον, recalling Gal. ii. 9: "Brave and powerful in faith, not only for himself, but also for comforting and sustaining others;" and remarks on ἔξω οὐ μὴ ἐξέλθῃ ἔτι, "by apostasy, not by excommunication;" on γρ. ἐπ' αὐτ. τ. ὄν τ. θ. μ., "for they [viz., bishops] represent in the Church the person of God;" on καταβ. ἐκ τ. οὐρ.: "For the Church militant is ruled and directed by the Holy Spirit;" and on τ. ὄν, μ. τὸ καινόν: "As the Lord himself at the circumcision was called Jesus, and afterwards Christ, so believers are first called disciples of Jesus, and then[1] Christians.[2] Similar distortions occur in Grot.,[3] Wetst.,[4] etc. The correct reference to the future glory[5] is not in any way, as with Beng., to be so limited that the first promise ποιήσω αὐτ. στύλον ἐν τ. ναῷ τ. θ. μ. is fulfilled already at the time of vii. 15, and before that of ch. xix., on the ground that there will be no temple in the new Jerusalem.[6] For if it be said that in the new Jerusalem there will be no special place for the worship and revelation of God, as God himself will be immediately near all the blessed, this does not prevent, that, according to an idea of an entirely different kind, but of essentially the same meaning, the entire community of perfected believers is contemplated as the temple of God, in which individuals may appear as pillars. This is only a transfer of the figure of the temporal to that of the heavenly communion of saints;[7] while the figure contains a significant feature, founded neither upon Isa. xxii. 23,[8] nor 1 Kings vii. 15 sqq.,[9] in that[10] by being compared not to foundation-stones, but to the pillars of the temple,[11] they are represented in their immutable firmness (κ. ἔξω, κ.τ.λ.) and glorious adornment. Incorrectly, Eichh.:[12] "The friends of the King, having more intimate access to him, who are admitted to his counsels, may be called columns." — καὶ ἔξω οὐ μὴ ἐξέλθῃ ἔτι. The subject is not ὁ στύλος,[13] but ὁ νικῶν.[14] Therefore the remark on ἐξέλθῃ is in no wise necessary, that the verb as intransitive expresses the[15] sense of a passive.[16] He who once, in the sense above indicated, is made a victor in the temple of God, henceforth shall no more go forth, either voluntarily (viz., by a fall), or under constraint. — καὶ γράψω ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ μου. Cf. in general *Tr. Bara bathra*, p. 75, 2:[17] "R. Samuel . . . says that R. Jochanan said that three are called by the name of God; e.g., the righteous,[18]

[1] Acts xi.

[2] The Jesuit C. a Lap. (cf. the brethren of his order, *Ribera*, *Vieg.*) thinks that, according to "the new name" which the Lord received at his circumcision, the victors will be called "Jesuani" or "Jesuits."

[3] οὐ μὴ ἐξέλθῃ: "Will not be compelled again to flee as under Nero." τ. ὄν. τ. πολ. τ. θεμ.: "This name is the Catholic Church, viz., as it was free and flourishing under the Christian emperors."

[4] στυλ., in opposition to the earthquakes which were frequent at Philadelphia. Cf. ver. 1.

[5] Calov., Beng., Eichh., Heinr., Ew., De Wette, Hengstenb., Ebrard, Klief.

[6] xxi. 22.

[7] Cf. 1 Cor. iii. 16 sqq.; Eph. ii. 19 sqq.; 1 Pet. ii. 5 sqq.

[8] Eichh., Ew.

[9] Grot., Vitr., Züll.

[10] Cf. De Wette, etc.

[11] Gal. ii. 9.

[12] Cf. ver. 8.

[13] Eich., Ebr.

[14] Ew., De Wette, Hengstenb., Klief.

[15] Vitr., Eichh., Ew.

[16] Possibly ἐκβάλλεσθαι. Cf. Mark iv. 21; Gen. xliii. 18; Matt. viii. 12, ix. 33. Syr.

[17] In Wetst.

[18] Isa. xliii. 7.

the Messiah,[1] and Jerusalem.[2] — *ἐπ' αὐτόν*, viz., upon the victor,[3] not upon the pillar.[4] Areth. says more accurately: *ἐπὶ τὸν νοητὸν στύλον* [on the mental pillar]; yet here the *αὐτόν* is entirely identical with the preceding object (*ποιήσω*) *αὐτόν*. If the question be asked as to where the inscription is to be regarded as written, the answer is to be given otherwise than ii. 17, and according to xiv. 1, xxii. 4 (cf. xvii. 5, vii. 3): "upon the forehead." Since the *ναός* is mentioned, the thought is closely connected therewith of the inscription upon the high priest's[5] diadem, קדש ליהוה;[6] and that, too, the more as by *τὸ ὄνομα τ. θ. μ.* the holy name יהוה[7] is meant.[8] At all events,[9] the holy and blessed state of belonging to God is expressed. — So, too, the name of the city of God — which is arbitrarily traced to a breast-shield of the wearer, instead of the names of the twelve tribes[10] — designates the right of citizenship in the new Jerusalem.[11] The name "city" need not, however, be derived from Ezek. xlviii. 35,[12] — although the description (xxi. 3 sqq.) is applicable as an exposition of that significant designation, — but John himself calls the city of God *ἡ καινὴ Ἱερουσαλήμ.* — *ἡ καταβαίνουσα, κ.τ.λ.* The construction as i. 5. The meaning of the expression is elucidated by ch. xxi. Falsely rationalizing, not only Grot.: "It has been procured by the wonderful kindness of God," but even Calov.:[13] "It has God as its author." — *κ. τ. ὄνομά μου τὸ καινόν.* Not the name mentioned in xix. 16,[14] but that meant in xix. 12.[15] But he who bears the new name of the Lord is thereby designated as eternally belonging to the Lord as though with the Lord's own signature. If, however, the name of the Lord in this sense and significance can be placed alongside of that of God and the new Jerusalem, the Lord must verily be the one that in ver. 7 he professes to be; in that also he says of himself *ποιήσω, γράψω*, he proclaims himself as one who is to be recognized as the eternal King of the kingdom of heaven.

Vv. 14–22. The epistle to the church at Laodicea. — Laod. in Phrygia, so called after Laodice, the wife of King Antiochus II. (formerly Diospolis, then Rhoas), reckoned by Tacitus[16] among the "renowned cities of Asia," a rich manufacturing and commercial city,[17] lay east of Ephesus, south-east of Philadelphia, in the neighborhood of Colosse,[18] on the river Lycus, — and hence called, in distinction from other places of the same name, Λ. *ἡ ἐπὶ Λύκῳ*, — or, more accurately, on the river Caprus, which, flowing into the Lycus, is received by the Meander. The ruins of ancient L. are found at the present unimportant town of Eski-Hissar.[19] Already at the time of the Apostle Paul,[20] a Christian church existed at L. A bishop and martyr at L., Sagaris,

[1] Jer. xxiii. 6.
[2] Ezek. xlviii. 35.
[3] Vitr., Calov., Schöttg., Eichh., Heinr., Ewald, Züll., Hengstenb., Ebrard.
[4] Grot., De Wette.
[5] Cf. i. 6.
[6] Schöttg., Eichh., Ewald.
[7] Cf. i. 8.
[8] Grot., Vitr., etc.
[9] Calov., Hengstenb., Ebrard.
[10] Schöttg.
[11] Cf. xxi. 3 sqq.
[12] Vitr., Ewald, etc.
[13] Cf. Luke xx. 4; Jas. iii. 15.
[14] Grot., Calov., Vitr., Hengstenb.
[15] Eichh., De Wette, Stern, Ebrard, etc.
[16] *Ann.*, xiv. 27.
[17] Hence Tacitus reports: "In the same year (62) Laodicea, being overthrown by an earthquake, without any aid from us, but by its own strength, recovered." Cf. on vv. 1–6.
[18] Cf. Col. ii. 1, iv. 13 sq.
[19] Cf. Winer, *Rwb.*
[20] Cf. Col. in various places.

in the year 170 A.D., is mentioned by Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 26, v. 24; but even Archippus[1] is already named as bishop.[2] Each of these has been regarded the "angel" of the church; and Hengstenb. immediately afterwards in the expression ἡ ἀρχὴ τ. κτ., ver. 14, discovers an allusion to the name of *Arch*-ippus as the most influential elder at Laodicea.[3] — According to Col. ii., Paul had the same care for the church at Laod. as for that at Colosse,[4] since these neighboring churches were exposed in like manner to certain Judaizing, and at the same time theosophizing (gnosticizing), erroneous doctrines. Of these there is no immediate trace in the Apoc. epistles.[5] But, on the contrary, the lukewarmness and proud self-sufficiency and self-righteousness of the church are rejected. Perhaps the state of affairs is to be regarded in such a way, that, while the peculiar gnosticizing aberration was averted from the church by the "conflict" of the Apostle Paul, yet that this, scarcely without the influence of its own riches, and of the entire tone of worldly culture and worldly enjoyment prevailing in a wealthy commercial city, had occurred in a worldly way, in which, on the one hand, the candid confession of the Lord, always opposing worldliness in warm words and zealous conduct, was missed, while, on the other hand, the trust in a certain external inoffensiveness manifested itself as an arrogant self-righteousness, which even before[6] was in another way to be dreaded.

Ver. 14. ὁ Ἀμήν. This Hebraistic expression[7] is, as to its meaning, entirely synonymous with the following Greek expressions: ὁ μάρτυς, ὁ πιστὸς καὶ ἀληθινὸς;[8] but the double designation of the Lord establishes with earnest emphasis the indubitable certainty of all that the Lord, who is the absolutely faithful witness (i. 5), has now to say to this church of his at Laod.; viz , the accusations (ver. 15 sqq.), the advice (ver. 18), the threatening and promise.[9] Not inappropriate, therefore, is the admonition that in and through Christ all God's promises are, and are to be, fulfilled;[10] from which the inference has been derived, that the epistle to the church at Laod. is to be regarded the Amen of all the seven epistles,[11] or that in the designations of the Lord, ver. 14, a warrant is to be sought for the fulfilment of what is said in chs iv. sqq.[12] The question here is not with respect to the promises or other utterances of *God*,[13] which have their fulfilment in *Christ*, but with respect to the discourses of *Christ himself* which have *in him*[14] their guaranty. Hence it is not correct when N. de Lyra adds to ὁ μαρτ., κ τ.λ., "of paternal majesty." As a "witness," the Lord here manifests himself, however, as entirely determined by all his testimonies in the following epistle. — ἀληθινός. Not synonymous with πιστός (= ἀληθής: so ordinarily), but just because the Lord is a faithful, and, because of his truth, an unconditionally trustworthy

[1] Col. iv. 17.

[2] *Const. Apost.*, viii. 46.

[3] Concerning the Easter controversy at Laodicea, in the time of Sagaris, cf. G. E. Steitz: "Die Diff. der Oec. u. d. Kleinasiaten in der Paschafeier," *Stud. u. Kritik.*, 1856, pp. 769, 778 sqq.

[4] Cf. also Col. iv. 16.

[5] On the contrary, Vitr., p. 161.

[6] Cf. Col. ii. 18.

[7] Cf., as to the form, 2 Cor. i. 20.

[8] Cf. Bengel, Ewald, Hengstenb.

[9] Vitr., Hengstenb., etc.

[10] Grot., De Wette, etc.

[11] Züll.

[12] De Wette, Stern.

[13] 2 Cor. i. 20. Cf. also Isa. lxv. 16.

[14] Cf. John xiv. 6; N. de Lyra, etc.

witness, is he a *true*, actual, and genuine witness who deserves this name.[1] — ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ θεοῦ. Cf. Col. i. 15 sqq., on which Meyer has refuted the erroneous expositions which essentially recur in reference to this passage. According to the wording, ἡ ἀρχὴ τ. κτ. τ. θ. cannot signify ὁ ἀρχων, the *prince* of God's creation;[2] also the κτίσις τ. θ., "the creature restored, creates new things," the church;[3] and still less can the expression signify what in i. 5 follows of course the ὁ μαρτ. ὁ πιστ., although there it is said in clear words: ὁ πρωτότοκος τῶν νεκρῶν.[4] The wording in itself allows only two conceptions: either Christ is designated "the beginning of the creation of God," i.e., as the first creature[5] of God,[6] as Ew. and Züll. understand it in harmony with the Arians;[7] or, the Lord is regarded as the *active* principle of the creation.[8] Unconditionally decisive for the latter alternative, which, however, dare not be perverted by a reference to the spiritual new creation,[9] is the fundamental view of Christ, which is expressed in the Apoc., as well as in every other book of the N. T. How could Christ have caused even the present epistle to be written, if he himself were a creature? How could every creature in heaven and earth worship him,[10] if he himself were one of them?[11] The designation of the Lord, that he is A and Ω, need only be recalled in its necessary force, and it will be found that in the A lies the fact that Christ is the ἀρχή of the creation,[12] while in the Ω lies the fact of Christ's *coming* to *make* an end of the visible creation. [See Note XXXIX., p. 184.]

Vv. 15, 16. Οἶδά σου τὰ ἔργα, ὅτι, κ.τ.λ. Cf. vv. 1, 8. The works, i.e., the entire life as it comes into manifestation, show that the church is "neither cold nor hot," but "lukewarm." The rabbinical expression בֵּינוֹנִים, "the intermediates,"[13] has only a very indefinite resemblance to this passage. Every explanation referring to the general sphere of psychology and ethics is unsatisfactory, as the question here is with regard to the relations of the church to its Lord.[14] It is plain that the ζεστός[15] is an actual believer, who with ardent love cleaves only to his Lord, and therefore asks for none else.[16] Such "heat" Paul, e.g., records in Phil. iii. 8 sqq. In contrast with such a ζεστός, the ψυχρός can only be one who is "beyond all influence of the Divine Spirit, as unbelievers, the heathen;"[17] but such contrast is inapplicable here, where such persons are addressed, to whom divine things and the workings of the Holy Ghost are actually not entirely foreign. This, Hengstenb. has correctly felt, but incorrectly applied, when he first explains the "coldness"

[1] Cf. ver. 7.

[2] Eichh. Cf. also Calov., Beng.

[3] ℵ$_1$ consequently reads τ. ἐκκλησίας. But it is amended. Grot., Wetst., Eichh., Heinr. Cf. C. a Lap.

[4] Cf., besides, Eichh.

[5] Cf., on ἀρχή, Gen. xlix. 3; Deut. xxi. 17.

[6] Cf. Prov. viii. 22.

[7] Castalio says: "*chef d'œuvre*, — the most excellent and first of all God's works."

[8] Andr., Areth., N. de Lyra, Vatabl., Calov., Vitr., Wolf, Stern, Hengstenb., Ebrard. Cf. also De Wette, Ew. ii.

[9] Klief.

[10] v. 13.

[11] Cf. xix. 10.

[12] Cf. Col. i. 15, 16; John i. 3.

[13] "There are three classes of men: for there are either the perfectly righteous, or the perfectly godless, or the intermediary." *Sohar. Gen.*, p. 83; in Schöttg.

[14] Cf. Hengstenb. So Eichh., Heinr.: "Of uncertain disposition, and altogether of doubtful mind;" "without character." C. a Lap.: "Who vacillate between virtues and vices." Cf. N. de Lyra, Calov., etc.

[15] Rom. xii. 11.

[16] Cf. Aret., De Wette, Hengstenb., Ebrard.

[17] De Wette. Cf. Grot., Beng., Ebrard.

very indefinitely as "selfishness," but then — with reference to the wish ὄφελον, κ.τ.λ. — understands such coldness "as is combined with the painful consciousness that one is cold, and with the heartfelt desire to become warm." This is entirely against the context. Rather the "coldness" in direct and absolute opposition to "hot," unconditional love to the Lord, is to be regarded as hostility and opposition. Thus Saul was "cold" as long as he persecuted the Lord. But since as from Saul a Paul, and from one that is cold, one that is hot can be made more readily than from one that is lukewarm,[1] the wish ὄφελον, κ.τ.λ., is therefore justified.[2] — Concerning ὄφελον as a particle, and combined with the imp., cf. 2 Cor. xi. 1.[3] — οὕτως. Cf. Rom. i. 15. It is noted that the relation is not in fact of such a kind as has just been wished, but rather as is stated by the accusation, which also here in explanation of the οὕτως is expressly repeated, so that the reason for the threatening is completely established: μέλλω σε ἐμέσαι, κ.τ.λ. — χλιαρός. The definite, positive expression for the οὔτε ψυχρὸς οὔτε ζεστός designates the indecision and incompleteness of the relation to the Lord, where he is neither entirely rejected nor entirely received, — a position which cannot exist[4] without inner sordidness, indolence, and self-deception.[5] See, in general, Matt. vi. 24, xii. 30; 1 John ii. 15; Jas. iv. 4. — The threatened ἐμέσαι ἐκ τ. στομ. μ. is stated in accordance with the idea of the χλιαρός, because lukewarmness provokes nausea. By the μέλλω, the Lord refers to his judgment which is already approaching; he is already just about coming, and then rejecting this church opposing him, for it may be that it will yet first obey his call to repentance (ver. 20). While ii. 5, xvi. 23, iii. 3, declare the indubitable judgment in the future with respect to the case, there expressly designated, of not being converted, the μέλλω[6] here leaves the possibility open that the judgment may be averted, although the condition for it is expressly stated first in ver. 20.[7]

Vv. 17, 18. Ὅτι λέγεις gives the foundation for the συμβουλεύω following in the second part of the sentence, ver. 18.[8] Hengstenb. incorrectly finds the reproach of lukewarmness grounded in ver. 17; this has occurred already in ver. 15.[9] The construction is like that of xviii. 7, 8. — ὅτι recitative. — πλούσιος — ἔχω. The decision as to whether wealth in earthly money and property,[10] or the fancied[11] wealth in spiritual blessings,[12] be meant, — in no event both at the same time,[13] — depends not upon the (doubtful) prefiguration of Hos. xii. 9,[14] nor upon the fact that the speech put into the mouth of the church must refer to possessions of the same kind, as the reply of the Lord (καὶ οὐκ οἶδας, κ.τ.λ.) manifestly referring to spiritual treasures,[15] but upon the

[1] The opinion derived from physics, that what is lukewarm becomes warm more rapidly than what is cold, should never have been expressed if considerations of what is reasonable were taken into the account.

[2] Grot., Beng., De Wette, etc.

[3] See Meyer on the passage. Winer, p. 283.

[4] Cf. De Wette.

[5] Cf. ver. 17. Cf. ver 2.

[6] Cf. Beng., etc.

[7] Beng., De Wette, Ebrard.

[8] Cf. the connection of ver. 16 with οὕτως.

[9] Andr., Areth., Aretius, C. a Lap., Beng., Ewald, Züll., etc.

[10] Λέγεις. Cf. ver. 9.

[11] Beda, N. de Lyra, Rib., Alcas., Grot., Calov., Vitr., Eichh., De Wette, Hengstenb., Ebrard, Ew. ii., etc.

[12] Stern.

[13] Cf. Zech. xi. 5.

[14] For a striking antithesis between earthly and heavenly riches is suggested (ii. 9).

fact that the self-witness of the church (*ὅτι πλούσιος εἰμί, κ.τ.λ.*) must harmonize inwardly with the reproach of lukewarmness (vv. 15, 16), and with the entire discourse of the Lord that follows. But this would not be the case, had the church fallen into the grossest mammon-worship, and entirely forgotten any higher need beyond that of their earthly riches. A church, on the contrary, which trusts in its spiritual riches, and still has the consciousness of having obtained these riches, will not be entirely without them,[1] but is, of course, implicated in an arrogant self-deception concerning its spiritual wealth. The church is in reality not rich;[2] for, if it were, it would not say so, as in ver. 17. [See Note XL., p. 184.] The three expressions *πλούσιος εἰμί — πεπλούτηκα — οὐδὲν χρείαν ἔχω*, designate a gradation:[3] the riches have so increased, that now at last there is no longer any need, but satiety has entered.[4] — *καὶ οὐκ οἶδας*. Therefore a self-deception of the church, for the Lord's knowledge[5] is decisive. — *ὅτι σὺ εἶ*. The *σὺ* has an emphatic position: just thou, thou who regardest thyself so rich. — *ὁ ταλαίπωρος*. This adjective occurs in the N. T., besides here, only in Rom. vii. 24. Because of his *ταλαιπωρία*,[6] one is *ἐλεεινός*, i.e., *ἐλέους ἄξιος* (worthy of pity).[7] The article before *ταλ.* notes with similar emphasis as the *σύ* before *εἶ*, that just the one thinking himself rich and elevated above all want is he to whom the *ταλαιπ.* applies. First of all, the *ταλαιπ.* and *ἐλεειν.* stand in sharp opposition to the final words of boasting, *οὐδ. χρείαν ἔχω*; then the *καὶ πτωχός* to the *πλουσ. εἰμὶ κ. πεπλούτ.*; while the ideas of the *τυφλός* and *γυμνός* are combined with that of the *πτωχός*, since spiritual poverty essentially identical with spiritual misery may be considered spiritual blindness and nakedness. Thus what the Lord judges concerning the true character of the church appears most definitely expressed in the three items *πτωχός*, *τυφλός*, and *γυμνός*; hence the advice which now follows (ver. 18) revolves about the same, as the *χρυσίον — πλουτήσῃς* applies to the *πτωχός*, the *ἱμάτια — γυμνότητος σου* to the *γυμνός*, and the *κολλούριον — ἵνα βλέπῃς* to the *τυφλός*. — *συμβουλεύω*. Not without a certain irony,[8] provoked by the arrogant imagination of the one so miserable and poor. Beng. finds in the expression an indication of estrangement, since it is only to strangers that advice, while to those who are one's own, a command, is given; — inapplicable. — *ἀγοράσαι*. The Roman-Catholic idea of a *meritum de congruo* can be derived from the *ἀγοράσαι* only when by pressing the expression, and in opposition to the context (ver. 17, *πτωχός*), an equivalent purchase price is in some way stated; and this is defined as "good works,"[9] or as "prayer, tears, repentance, good works."[10] But if the spiritual good to be obtained from the Lord be once regarded as *χρυσίον*, the result is, — especially according to the type of Isa. lv. 1, — that the corresponding concrete idea of the *ἀγοράσαι* is as readily designated as the purity of the *χρυσίον* by the metaphorical statement *πεπυρωμένον ἐκ πυρός*; and it is just as incorrect in the latter expression

[1] As "not being cold," it will not reject the Lord, the source of riches.
[2] As it is not "hot," and therefore does not have full fellowship with the Lord.
[3] Cf. N. de Lyra, Grot., Beng., De Wette.
[4] Cf. 1 Cor. iv. 8.
[5] Cf. ver. 15.
[6] Rom. iii. 16; Jas. v. 1.
[7] Suid.
[8] Cf. Ebrard.
[9] N. de Lyra.
[10] C. a Lap., etc.

to think of a confirmation of faith in trouble,[1] etc.,[2] as to treat the *ἀγοράσαι* in an unevangelical sense. In accord with the sense, Beng. explains: "It costs no more than the surrender of the idea of one's own wealth."[3] — *παρ' ἐμοῦ*. As the only Saviour. Cf. especially i. 5; in regard to the white garments which are to be purchased of the Lord, cf. vii. 14. — *χρυσίον*. Spiritual good as that which actually makes rich (*ἵνα πλουτήσῃς*), in contradistinction to the poverty of the church. To interpret the *χρυσίον* as "love,"[4] or as "faith,"[5] is too special. — *πεπυρωμένον ἐκ πυρός*. *πυρόω* = צָרַף, Zech. xiii. 9. The *ἐκ* represents the *πῦρ* as the cause whence the *πυροῦσθαι* proceeds;[6] according to the sense, it is therefore correctly rendered "purified by fire."[7] The entire expression designates not "wisdom inflamed with love,"[8] or "tested faith;"[9] as, on the contrary, the exposition must be made, that it is only through faith that the *χρυσ. πεπυρ. ἐκ πυρ.* is won: but as the purified gold is completely pure and truly precious, so is the spiritual good to be obtained of the Lord unconditionally holy and true, and eternally enriching. — *καὶ ἱματία λευκά, κ.τ.λ.* Cf. ver. 4, vii. 14, xix. 8. Only in the figurative mode of presentation, and not in the proper sense, are the "white garments" to be distinguished from the "gold," just as nakedness is in reality nothing but poverty. The remark of Ebrard is arbitrary, that "the command is to be executed in the reverse order from that in which it is given. The ultimate end, to become rich, viz., in good fruits that have some value before God, is first named; for this, gold must be bought. But before gold can be considered, garments must first be purchased in order to cover the nakedness; and as the covering of the nakedness cannot be accomplished before the eyes are open, eyesalve must first of all be applied." But the "gold" is mentioned first only because, with respect to fancied riches and actual poverty (ver. 17), this is the nearest thought; but the succession of the particular items neither in ver. 17 nor ver. 18 is to be urged, since the *τυφλός* and *γυμνός* are connected with the *πτωχός*, in ver. 17, in a different order from the corresponding members in ver. 18. Only the chief idea *πτωχός*, and the corresponding clause in ver. 18, naturally precede. — *καὶ μὴ φανερωθῇ*. N. de Lyra: "Before God and the holy angels." Beng.: "Before God." But no such restriction is needed. — *κολλούριον*. In classical writers, *κολλύριον*. The word designates a substance brought to the long round form of a *κολλύρα*, *roll* (e.g., breadcake), which being mixed with various drugs was used for anointing the eyes.[10] The Jewish designation קולורין (קילורית) agrees with the form *κολλούριον*. Here is meant, not the word of God itself,[11] but the gift of the Holy Ghost which enlightens,[12] offered indeed by means of the word, and that, too,[13] already by the present word with its reproof[14] and grace.[15] Cf. 1 John

[1] As the idea is, in fact, applied, e.g., in 1 Pet. i. 7.
[2] Aret., Vitr., Stern, etc.
[3] Cf. Vitr., Calov., etc.
[4] C. a Lap.
[5] Aret., Vitr., Hengstenb., etc.
[6] Cf. viii. 11.
[7] Luther.
[8] i.e., *fides formata*. N. de Lyra.
[9] Hengstenb.
[10] Wetst.
[11] Stern. Cf. Ps. 9. xix. Hence, in *Tr. Siphra*, p. 143, 2: "The words of the law are the crown of the head, — *collyrium*, to the eyes." In Schöttgen.
[12] N. de Lyra, Aret., Calov., Vitr., Hengstenb., etc.
[13] Ebrard.
[14] Ver. 15 sqq.
[15] Ver. 19 sqq.

ii. 27. Even here the prefixed *παρ' ἐμοῦ* applies,[1] for the Holy Ghost is the Spirit of Christ, sent by him.[2] The correct knowledge attained by such enlightening (*ἵνα βλέπῃς*) is, however, in fact, at the same time the true treasure, spiritual riches. Upon this depends the inner harmony in the co-ordination of the three points *χρυσίον, κ.τ.λ*, *ἱμάτια λευκά, κ.τ.λ.*, and *κολλούριον, κ.τ.λ.*, as in ver. 17 *πτωχός, τυφλός*, and *γυμνός*.

Ver. 19. Ἐγώ emphatically prefixed. The Lord, who alone is the true witness (ver. 14), and, at the same time, the one from whom the true gold can be obtained (ver. 18), appears as witness against those whom he loves, since through his *ἐλέγχειν* and *παιδεύειν* he wishes to make them zealous unto repentance (*ζηλ. κ. μεταν*), and thus participant of his eternal blessings. — *ὅσους ἐὰν φιλῶ*. Concerning the *ἐὰν* after the relative in N. T. diction, cf. my note on 1 John iii. 20. Grot. says incorrectly: "*φιλῶ*, not absolutely, but relatively; i.e., those whom I have not altogether determined, because of their long-continued sins, to cast away and harden." Upon a similar misunderstanding rests the remark of Vitringa, that the kind address is directed only to the better part of the church. On the contrary, the entire church is still an object of the seeking love of the Lord. — *ἐλέγχω καὶ παιδεύω*. The distinction between the two expressions does not lie in the *ἐλέγχειν* occurring by means of words, and the *παιδεύειν* by chastisements;[3] but the *παιδεύειν* designating discipline, i.e., education in general,[4] may occur as well by *ἐλέγχειν*, as by perceptible chastisements, as *μαστιγοῦν*.[5] The *ἐλέγχειν*[6] occurs when the wrong is so placed before the eyes of any one that he must acknowledge it. From ver. 15 on, the Lord has exercised his *ἐλέγχειν* by completely disclosing the faults of the church; yet he expressly says that this, as well as his entire *παιδεύειν*, proceeds from love. It is nowhere said that in this he has already employed, or will employ, what are the proper means of chastisement (blows). On the other hand, to the *παιδεύειν* belongs the advice of ver. 18. Yet this advice contains the express assurance, that, with the Lord, gold, etc., shall not be lacking. Hence not only the relentless *ἐλέγχειν*, but also the tendering of grace, is a *παιδεύειν*, which testifies to the Lord's love. But if the Lord thus manifests himself to the "lukewarm" church, it follows that this (*οὖν*) has to do what the command expressly says: *ζήλευε οὖν καὶ μετανόησον*. The words contain not a hysteron proteron,[7] but require of the church which is convicted of lukewarmness, an ardent zeal, enkindled by the love manifested by the Lord, and, as the proof of this zeal, a true change of mind.[8]

Ver. 20. If the epistle to the church at Laodicea be regarded as having a design differing in no essential point from that of the other epistles, neither can ver. 20 be regarded the epilogue,[9] which rather comprises only vv. 21, 22, nor can the eschatological sense in ver. 20, which is properly made prominent by Ebrard, be denied, as is usually done. The *Ἰδοὺ ἑστηκα ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν*

[1] Cf. 1 John, l. c.
[2] Cf. Acts ii. 33; John xvi. 7, 14.
[3] Blows, Luke xxiii., xvi. 22. Aret., Grot.
[4] Acts xxii. 3, vii. 22; Tit. ii. 12; 2 Tim. ii. 25.
[5] Cf. Heb. xii. 6 with Prov. iii. 12.
[6] Cf. John xvi. 8, viii. 46, iii. 20; 1 Cor. xiv. 24.
[7] De Wette.
[8] Cf. Grot., Beng., Hengstenb., Ebrard.
[9] Vitr.

καὶ κρούω, κ.τ.λ., is essentially nothing else than the ἐρχομαι ταχύ, or ἥξω with its paracletic applications.[1] The door before which the Lord stands, and asks entrance by his knock (κρούω) and call (cf. ἀκ. τ. φωνῆς μου), is ordinarily understood as the door of the heart,[2] and, accordingly, the κρούειν, as the preaching of the gospel,[3] the movements occasioned by the Holy Spirit,[4] while special providential dispensations, are also added.[5] The εἰσελεύσομαι, κ.τ.λ., is not then understood in its full personal sense,[6] and the δειπνήσω limited either entirely to the blessed communion of believers with the Lord in this life,[7] or, as is entirely out of place, to the communion in the present and the future life.[8] The latter reference Beng. obtains by understanding the δειπν. μετ' αὐτοῦ of the earthly, and the κ. αὐτ. μετ. ἐμοῦ of the heavenly life. In their peculiar nature the κρούειν and the φωνή of the Lord, whereby he asks entrance, are not distinct from the ἐλέγχειν and παιδεύειν, ver. 19, just as it is from the same love that he does both the former and the latter. His coming is near; he stands already before the door. And he wishes the church at Laodicea also to be prepared to receive him, in order that he may not come in judgment,[9] but to enter therein, and hold with it the feast of blessed communion.[10] The sense, especially of the formula δειπν. μετ' αὐτοῦ κ. αὐτὸς μετ' ἐμοῦ, expressing the complete communion of the one with the other, is that of John xvii. 24; Col. iii. 4.[11] — An immediate connection with Cant. v. 2[12] is not discernible; although it is incorrectly asserted[13] that in the N. T. in general, and in the Apoc. especially, no trace whatever of the Song of Solomon can be detected. Ebrard, appropriately: "The figure (of the wedding), or this idea together with the general doctrine of the relation of Christ to his Church as bridegroom, depends upon the Song of Solomon." But in our passage the idea, in general, of Christ as bridegroom is not definitely expressed.[14] [See Note XLI., p. 184.]

Vv. 21, 22. Cf. ii. 26, 27. The νικᾶν embraces the temptations and perils lying in the peculiar circumstances of the Church,[15] but is not limited thereto, so that it can correspond to the Lord's conflict and victory in suffering.[16] — The promised reward δώσω αὐτῷ καθίσαι, κ.τ.λ., i.e., participation in Christ's royal dominion,[17] is here, just as at the close of all the epistles, to be expected as the victory over the world, sin, and death,[18] only in eternity, and not in this life, since the ἐκάθισα, κ.τ.λ., has occurred to the Lord through his ascension.[19] Entirely wrong is Calov.'s distinction between the throne of God the Father, whereon Christ sits, and the throne of Christ, whereon the believer is to sit with him. The throne of God and of the Lamb is one;[20]

[1] ii. 5, 16, iii. 3, 11. Cf. also ii. 10, 22 sq.
[2] N. de Lyra, C. a Lap., Stern, Aret., Grot., Calov., Vitr., Ew., De Wette, Hengstenb.
[3] Aret, etc.
[4] De Wette.
[5] Hengstenb.
[6] Grot.: "Jesus Christ, where he sends his Spirit."
[7] N. de Lyra, C. a Lap., Grot., Hengstenb., etc.
[8] Vitr., Calov., Stern, etc.
[9] Cf. ver. 3, ii. 5.
[10] Cf. ch. xix.; Matt. xxv. 1 sqq.
[11] Cf., on both passages, in the preceding verses, the corresponding description of the earthly fellowship of faith with the Lord.
[12] Hengstenb.; several ancient expositors.
[13] Ew., De Wette.
[14] Especially against Eichh., Heinr.
[15] Ver. 16 sq. [16] Cf. v. 5.
[17] Cf. i. 9, xxii. 5; 2 Tim. ii. 12.
[18] Vitr.
[19] Cf. Heb. xii. 2; Phil. ii. 9.
[20] xxii. 1.

the glory of the victor is communion with the Father and the Son.[1] The promise to the victor is here made so strong, not because the struggle which the Laodiceans had to maintain against their own lukewarmness is regarded the most severe,[2] but because it is natural and suitable, that, in the last of the seven epistles, such a promise should be expressed as would combine all the others, and designates the highest and most proper goal of all Christian hope, and the entire Apocalyptic prophecy.

Notes by the American Editor.

XXXV. Ver. 4. *περιπατήσουσιν μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐν λευκοῖς.*

Trench: "The promise of life, for only the living walk, the dead are still; of liberty, for the free walk, and not the fast-bound." Gerhard (*Loc. Th.*, xx. 328) finds, in the white garments, "the symbol of victory, innocency, glory, and joy, yea, even royal dignity." Gebhardt: "The bright or white garments symbolize positive purity, holiness, or righteousness (cf. xix. 8)."

XXXVI. Ver. 5. *τῆς βίβλου τῆς ζωῆς.*

If an erasure from the book of life be regarded possible, the inscription cannot refer to election, as this is indefectible. But it seems to be pressing the passage too far, to derive from it such meaning; as the expression is, in fact, simply a litotes whereby to emphasize the certainty of salvation, i.e., an assumed, but not a real, possibility.

XXXVII. Ver. 7. *τὴν κλεῖν Δαυείδ.*

Trench: "Those keys which he committed to Peter and his fellow-apostles (Matt. xvi. 19), he announces to be, in the highest sense, his own. It depends on him, the supreme *κληδοῦχος* in the house of God, who shall see the King's face, and who shall be excluded from it. From the highest tribunal on earth, there lies an appeal to a tribunal of yet higher instance in heaven, — to His, who opens, and no man can shut; who shuts, and no man can open; and when, through ignorance or worse than ignorance, any wrong has been done to any of his servants here, he will redress it there, disallowing and reversing, in heaven, the erring or unrighteous decrees of earth."

XXXVIII. Ver. 8. *ὅτι μικρὰν ἔχεις δύναμιν.*

Plumptre: "The words point to something in the past history of the church of Philadelphia and its ruler, the nature of which we can only infer from them and from their context. Some storm of persecution had burst upon him, probably at Smyrna, instigated by the Jews, or the Judaizing section of the church. They sought to shut the door which he had found open, and would have kept so. They were strong, and he was weak; numbers were against him, and one whose faith was less real and living might have yielded to the pressure. But he, though not winning, like Antipas, the martyr's crown, had yet displayed the

[6] Cf. John xvii. 22, 24.

[7] Ebrard.

courage of the confessor. Like the faithful servant in the parable, he had thus been faithful in a very little (Matt. xxv. 23); and therefore, as the promise that follows shows, he was to be 'made ruler over many things.'"

XXXIX. Ver. 14. *ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως.*

Philippi (*Kirch. Glaub.*, ii. 215): "He is the beginning of the creation; the beginning, and, as such, the principle, the original source, and author, and therefore not himself a creature. So God himself is also called the beginning and the end (Rev. xxi. 6), and, in like manner, Christ (xxii. 13)." Gebhardt (pp. 90–98) refutes the interpretations of Baur, Hoekstra, Köstlin, Weiss, and Ritschl; and states the true interpretation to be as follows: "What exposition is demanded by the laws of language? Without further delay, I reply, that, had the seer written 'the beginning of the creatures (*κτίσματα*) of God,' or had he written 'the first, or the first-born, or the first-fruit (*πρῶτος, πρωτότοκος, ἀπαρχή*), of the creation of God,' then the expression might be understood to denote the first created, or that which precedes all things, the first creature in time and rank. But the seer has written *ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ θεοῦ*, which can mean nothing else than *principium creationis*, the principle, the *ἐν ᾧ, δι' οὗ, εἰς ὅ*, of the creation of God. After this affirmation of the literal sense, I may say that it finds confirmation in i. 17, 18; ii. 8. . . . To a church in which Christ not only discovers self-blindness, but which he threatens to spew out of his mouth, which he counsels to seek help from himself for its disease, to which he says that he rebukes and chastens those whom he loves, — in a word, to a church to which he reveals himself as to no other in his fullest and highest significance, and we must remember that we have to do with the last of the seven letters, — "the first creature" has not, in any of its possible meanings, a really satisfactory sense; and we find that sense only when we understand it to mean the principle of the creation of God, i.e., the personal, mediatorial, essential ground and end of the creation. Thus simply explained, according to the laws of language, the passage (iii. 14), taken in connection with those quoted before, furnishes us with a very remarkable result, viz., that the seer has expressed the 'Logos' idea itself in its highest meaning."

XL. Ver. 17. *οὐκ οἶδας ὅτι, κ.τ.λ.*

Plumptre: "As Mr. Carlyle has somewhere put it, in one of those epigrams that haunt one's memory, 'it is the hypocrisy which does not know itself to be hypocritical.' It may be noted, as tending to confirm the assumption that the Gospel of St. John and the Apoc. were the work of the same writer, that this is the fault which in the former, again and again, he notes for special condemnation. Those who could not believe are less the object of his censure than those who, believing, feared to confess the Christ lest they should be put out of the synagogue (John xii. 42, 43)."

XLI. Ver. 20. *ἰδοὺ ἕστηκα, κ.τ.λ.*

Alford, on the contrary: "The reference to Cant. v. 2 is too plain to be for a moment doubted; and, if so, the interpretation must be grounded in that conjugal relation between Christ and the Church, — Christ and the soul, — of which that mysterious book is expressive. This being granted, we may well say that

the vivid depiction of Christ standing at the door is introduced to bring home to the lukewarm and careless church the truth of his constant presence, which she was so deeply forgetting. His knocking was taking place, partly by the utterance of these very rebukes, partly by every interference in justice and mercy." Trench: "The very language which Christ uses here, the *κρούειν ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν*, the summons *ἀνοίγειν* recurs. Nor is the relation between the one passage and the other merely superficial and verbal. The spiritual condition of the bride there is, in fact, precisely similar to that of the Laodicean angel here. Between sleeping and waking, she has been so slow to open the door, that, when at length she does so, the Bridegroom has withdrawn. This exactly corresponds to the lukewarmness of the angel here. Another proof of the connection between them is, that, although there has been no mention of any thing but a knocking here, Christ goes on to say, 'If any man hear my voice.' What can this be but an allusion to the words in the *canticle*, which have just gone before: 'It is the *voice* of my beloved that knocketh'?"

The reference, by Bengel, of the *δειπνήσω* to the communion both in this life and the life to come, may have found, in the distinction between *μετ' αὐτοῦ* and *μετ' ἐμοῦ*, more than is intended; nevertheless, we can see, in this passage, only the blessed communion with God begun here on earth, and consummated in heaven, — not two communions, but one, at two different stages. Gebhardt (p. 127) finds the thought of the Lord's Supper suggested. Luthardt's brief notes refer to Luke xii. 36; interpreting the knocking as the impending return of the Lord, the opening of the door, by suggesting the familiar hymn of Paul Gerhardt, —

"Oh, how shall I receive thee?"—

and the supping, by the Lord's Supper in the kingdom of God (Matt. xxvi. 29; Luke xxii. 29, 30).

In connection with the *ἐάν τις ἀκούσῃ τῆς φωνῆς*, Trench's remarks are important as to the incompatibility of this passage with any doctrine of irresistible grace; as well as his warning against the Pelagian error, "as though men could open the door of their heart when they would, as though repentance was not itself a gift of the exalted Saviour (Acts v. 31). They can only open when Christ knocks, and they would have no desire at all to open unless he knocked. . . . This is a *drawing*, not a *dragging;* a knocking at the door, not a breaking open the heart." So Gerhard (*L. T.*, ii. 275): "When God, by his word, knocks at the door of our heart, especially by the proclamation of his law, the grace of the Holy Spirit is at the same time present, who wishes to work conversion in our heart; and therefore, in his knocking, he not only stands without, but also works within."

CHAPTER IV.

Ver. 1. *ἠνεῳγμένη*, Elz.; so also ℵ, Tisch. [W. and H.]. The form *ἀνεῳγμ.* (A), approved by Lach., depends upon a clerical error occasioned by the *α* in *θύρα*, as in 19, 11, where even A has the form *ἠνεῳγμ.*; cf., besides, xi. 19, xx. 12. Winer, p. 70. — *λέγων*. So, already, Griesb., instead of the correction *λέγουσα* (Elz.). — Ver. 2. The *καὶ* before *εὐθέως* (Elz.) is, according to A, ℵ, 2, 4, 8, al., Syr., Vulg., to be deleted (Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]); cf., already, Griesb.: yet the *μετὰ ταῦτα* here, as in i. 9, is to be combined with *δεῖ γενέσθαι*, not (Lach.) with *εὐθέως*. — *ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον καθήμενος*. So, already, Beng., according to A, ℵ, 2, 4, 6, 7, al., Vulg., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]. Incorrectly, Elz.: *ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου*. — In this often-recurring phrase, *ἐπὶ* is found with the accus., iv. 4, xi. 16, xvii. 3, xix. 11; also vi. 2, 4 (Elz., dat.), according to A, C, ℵ (Beng., Lach., Tisch.). With the gen., iv. 10, v. 1, 7; also vi. 16, Elz., Lach. — On the other hand, Tisch.: dat., according to 4, 6, 9, ℵ, al.). With the dat., iv. 9 (A, ℵ, Lach. — But Elz., Tisch. [W. and H.]: gen.), v. 13 (ℵ [W. and H.]: gen.), vii. 10, xix. 4, xxi. 5, where, in the Elz., the gen. throughout stands improperly. — Ver. 3. The *ἦν* before *ὅμοιος* (Elz.) is, according to the testimonies, and with Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.], to be deleted; cf. i. 14, 15. — Ver. 4. Elz.: *θρόνοι εἴκοσι καὶ τέσσαρες· καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς θρόνους εἶδον τοὺς εἴκοσι καὶ τέσσαρας πρεσβ.* Certainly false, in this reading, is: *first*, the (twofold) *καί* before *τεσσ.*; *secondly*, the explanation *εἶδον* beside the art. *τούς*. It is doubtful whether with Lach., Tisch. IX., *θρόνους εἴκοσι τέσσερας* must be read; for, in A, this accus. may have been inserted because of what follows. Beng., Griesb., Tisch. [W. and H.], etc., have the nominative. It is, further, doubtful whether the number should be combined the second time with *θρόνους* or with *πρεσβυτ.* The former is preferred by Lach., Tisch. IX., according to A, 17, 18, 19 (*κ. ἐπὶ τ. εἴκ. τέσσ. θρον. πρεσβ.*); the latter by Tisch. [W. and H.] (*τ. ἐπὶ τ. θρ. τοὺς εἴκ. τεσσ. πρεσβ.*; cf. 13, 26, 27, Areth.). It is, however, very possible that the reading of 2, 4, 8, 9, 11, al., according to which the number without *τοὺς* stands between *τ. θρόνους* and *πρεσβυτ.*, and accordingly could be taken with both nouns, is original. The reading, therefore, which is exegetically the more suitable, is *εἴκ. τεσσ. πρεσβ.* ℵ has only *καὶ πρεσβ.*, without *ἐπὶ τ. θρ.*, and without the repetition of the number, — possibly the original reading. — The *ἐν* before *ἱματίοις* (Elz., Tisch.) is probably false; it is wanting in A, Vulg., Lach. [W. and H.]. The *ἔσχον* (Elz.) before *ἐπὶ τ. κεφ.* is doubtless an interpretation. — Ver. 7. Instead of *ὡς ἄνθρωπος* (Elz., Beng.), *ὡς ἀνθρώπου* (A, Vulg., al., Treg., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]) is to be read, unless possibly *ἀνθρώπου* alone (2, 4, 6, al., Aeth., Ar., Andr., Areth., Matth.) is to be regarded the original reading. ℵ: *ὡς ὅμοιον ἀνθρώπῳ*. — Instead of *πετωμένῳ* (Elz.), write here and in viii. 13, xiv. 6, xix. 17, *πετομ.* (A, ℵ, 9, 14, 16, 19, Andr., Areth., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]). Cf. the scholium in Wetst.: *πέταμαι οὐδεὶς τῶν ῥητόρων εἶπεν, ἀλλὰ πέτομαι*. — Ver. 8. *ἓν καθ' ἑαυτὸ εἶχον*. So Elz. But Beng. and Griesb. already write correctly: *ἓν καθ' ἓν αὐτῶν ἔχον* (A, B, 2, 4, 6, 7, 10, al., Lach.). The *ἔχων* in A, which is approved here by Tisch. [W. and H.],

occurs also in ver. 7 in A, — not received there by Tisch., 1854, — in both places apparently as a clerical error. ℵ: ἐν ἕκαστον αὐτῶν εἶχον. — Ver. 11. Instead of the simple κύριε (Elz., Griesb.), read, according to A, B, 2, 3, al., Vulg.: ὁ κύριος καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν (Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]); ℵ has both. — ἦσαν. So A, ℵ, 2, 3, 4, al. pl., Griesb., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]. A mere modification is the εἰσι in Elz. Also, the isolated variation οὐκ ἦσαν, which Ew. favors, seems to be a not inapt expedient; since, by the inner combination of the οὐκ ἦσαν and ἐκτίσθ. ("when they were not, they were created," Ew.), the difficulty of the ἦσαν in the correct text is avoided. — That the words καὶ ἐκτίσθησαν are lacking in A, is only an oversight, as the eye of the transcriber wandered from the ἦσαν directly to the final syllable of ἐκτίσθ — ησαν.

In chapter iv. (and v.), the real divine foundation for the entire succeeding prophetic Apoc. (up to xxii. 5) is presented in a plastic manner. For the living God himself, whose throne in eternal glory is portrayed in ch. iv., determines what is to happen (δεῖ γεν., cf. i. 1, 19). Thus from him proceeds all revelation spoken by the mouth of a prophet,[1] and that, too, through the mediation of Christ.[2] Beng., appropriately: "In fact, this book (of John) describes not only what occurs on earth in good and evil, but also how things *originate* from the kingdom of light, and partly from the kingdom of darkness, and how they again extend thither."[3] But as in i. 12 sqq., the appearance of Christ was of such a nature as to stand in a living relation to the discourses of the Lord to his Church, following in chs. ii. and iii., so also the appearance of the Lord in ch. iv. already makes us know in advance that it treats of impending judgment towards enemies, and a showing of grace to believers. The holy and omnipotent majesty beheld of Him who was, and is, and is to come, and the standing of the "elders" about his throne, — already points, even apart from definite individual features, to the essential contents of the revelation which is to be expected. Cf. Beng.; also Hengstenb., who, however, inaccurately and erroneously says, "What is to occur afterwards is shown John. Accordingly, in ver. 2 sqq., we are to expect not a description of that which always is, but only a symbolical foreshadowing of the future."

If now we compare with the description, ch. iv., rabbinical representations, such as More Nevoch, II. 6: "God does nothing unless he have *considered* it in his family above," and Schir. Haschirim R., fol. 93: "God does nothing unless he have first *consulted* concerning it with his family above,"[4] — we dare not overlook the essential distinction that the Johannean view is nothing but a development of O. and N. T. fundamental truths, while the rabbins have only a corruption of them.[5] For "the family above," which, according to the rabbins, participates in the determining of God's counsels, in John has only to adore and praise the decree together with God's works; and the visions beheld by John, in which future things are portrayed to him while in the Spirit, are in no respect the heavenly prelude of earthly events

[1] Cf. i. 1.
[2] Cf. v. 1 sqq.
[3] Cf. also Ew., De Wette, Ebrard.
[4] In Wetst.
[5] Against Wetst., Eichh., Heinr., Ew., etc.

stated by the rabbins.[1] Ill-founded is the remark of Heinrichs: "In every chapter, the poet does nothing but testify that he has beheld the theatre whence *the Messiah is to return to earth* as the lofty and majestic" . . .

Ver. 1. Μετὰ ταῦτα εἶδον. The formula marks the entrance of a new vision, and that, too, a greater or more important one,[2] while the formula καὶ εἶδον introduces the various individual features represented in the course of a larger main picture.[3] The formula καὶ εἶδον, xiii. 1 and xvii. 3, stands at the beginning of an entirely new important division, and is therefore regular, because in both passages the opening of a new scene is indicated by the entire preceding verse, which in a measure prevents there the μετὰ ταῦτα. But since by the μετὰ ταῦτα the vision now following is distinguished from what is completed in iii 22, — the ταῦτα referring back to the entire vision in i. 10–iii. 22, — it is in no way indicated that between iii. 22 and iv. 1 there is a space in which John was not "in the Spirit," but in his ordinary consciousness, and perhaps penned the seven epistles. Thus Beng.: "John always comprehended one part after another in sight and hearing, and immediately wrote it." Cf. also Aret., Grot., Calov., Hengstenb.; and, against the latter, Ebrard's correct protest. Even De Wette, who nevertheless correctly acknowledges that John is already (iv. 1) "in Spirit," viz., from i. 10, fixes the committing of the seven epistles to writing between iii. 22 and iv. 1. But nowhere in the course of the entire revelation (i. 10–xxii. 16) is any temporary return from the ecstatic condition to ordinary consciousness conceivable, and therefore a partial noting-down is nowhere possible. The εἶδον, iv. 1, undoubtedly indicates that the "being in Spirit" beginning with i. 10 continues unbroken;[4] and from iv. 1 to the close of the entire revelation, an interruption of the ecstatic consciousness can nowhere be admitted, since the vision which follows always is developed from that which precedes.[5] There is *only* one "being in Spirit,"[6] in which John beheld the *entire* revelation with all its changing, yet coherent, scenes. — θύρα ἠνεῳγμ. ἐν τ. οὐρανῷ. The opening of heaven[7] is explained by means of a *door*, from the fact neither that heaven is regarded a firm arch,[8] nor that John is to *enter* heaven,[9] nor that heaven appears as a temple;[10] but that heaven is the house,[11] the palace of God (in which he is enthroned, Ps. xi. 4, xviii. 7, xxix. 9).[12] — ἡ φωνὴ, κ.τ.λ. Not the voice of Christ,[13] who indeed had spoken (chs. ii., iii.)[14] after the *first* voice,[15] but the voice first heard, which already (i. 10) is no further defined, and here also cannot be further designated than as it is identical with the former. — λέγων. The construction "accord-

[1] Cf. Wetst.: "According to the idea of the Jews, what is to occur on earth is first manifested and *represented* in heaven before the assembly of angels."

[2] vii. 1, 9, xv. 5, xviii. 1.

[3] v. 1, 6, 11, vi. 1, 5, 8, 9, 12, viii. 2, 13, ix. 1, x. 1, xiii. 11, xiv. 6, 14, xv. 1, 2, xvii. 6, xix. 11, 17, 19, xx. 1, 4, 11, xxi. 1.

[4] Ver. 2 does not contradict this, if only we do not, like Hengstenb., identify the being "in Spirit" and "in heaven."

[5] Cf. Introduction, p. 12 sqq.

[6] i. 10.

[7] Cf. Ezek. i. 11; Matt. iii. 16; Acts x. 11.

[8] Heinr.

[9] De Wette. Cf. Grot.

[10] Vitr., Züll.

[11] Gen. xxviii. 17.

[12] Cf. Eichh.

[13] Hengstenb., Klief., etc.

[14] Cf. i. 17 sqq.

[15] i. 10.

ing to sense"[1] is especially easy with the λεγων[2] introducing the direct address.[3] — Ἀναβά. With respect to the form, cf. Acts xii. 7; Mark xv. 30 (var.); Eph. v. xvii. Winer, p. 76. John ascending to heaven and to the things there to be seen, through the door opened on this account, which he beheld in ver. 1, is immediately present in spirit[4] at the significant representation of that which is henceforth to happen.[5] Klief., in violation of the context, asserts that a more elevated station is meant, from which John could look as well through the opened door into heaven, as also to a greater distance upon earth. — καὶ δείξω, κ.τ.λ. Thus the heavenly voice speaks, although the person to whom it belongs cannot be more definitely known, — as in later visions, where, however, the same angel does not everywhere appear as interpreter, and "show," — because the voice sounds forth in the name of the personal God himself, who, nevertheless, is efficacious beneath the one who shows (i 1), and causes also the prophet to be in the Spirit (cf. ver. 2). — ἃ δεῖ γεν. Cf. i. 1. — μετὰ ταῦτα, as i. 19.

Ver. 2. εὐθέως ἐγενόμην ἐν πνεύματι. The asyndeton emphasizes the significance of the εὐθέως. After John has heard the voice, ver. 1, he is immediately — and that too because of the voice[6] — "in the Spirit," and thereby made capable of ascending into heaven, and beholding the objects there presented. Although in ver. 1, John is already ἐν πνεύματι, i.e., in such a condition that he beholds the opened door, and can hear the heavenly voice, yet the mode of presentation, ver. 2, which, considered in itself alone, can designate the entire recent entrance of the ecstatic condition, has its justification in that an entirely new elevation of prophetic ecstasy belongs thereto, whereby John can ascend in spirit to heaven, and behold what is there shown him. Hence De Wette and Ebrard properly compare with this, Ezek. xi. 5. Even Hengstenb.[7] has to acknowledge, that, while ver. 2 designates "the complete entrance into the state of ecstasy," yet ver. 1 already is to be regarded a "preparation" to this condition. — Züll., incorrectly, just as i. 10: "I was *there* [in heaven] by ecstasy." — In rapid succession directly follows the description of that which is presented to the view of the one drawn into heaven: καὶ ἰδοὺ, θρόνος ἔκειτο, κ.τ.λ. To this entire description, there is a parallel in the *Pirke*, R. Elieser,[8] which is very instructive, because it shows how differently, with many similar features, the O. T. types[9] appear in a N. T. prophet, and the rabbins:[10] "Four bands of ministering angels praise God. The first is of Michael, on the right; the second, of Gabriel, on the left; the third, of Uriel, before him; the fourth, of Raphael, behind him. But the shekinah of God is in the centre, and he himself is seated on a lofty, elevated throne; and his seat is high, suspended in the air. The splendor of his magnificence is like Chasmal (Ezek. i. 4). Upon

[1] Cf. ver. 8, xi. 15, xix. 14; Eph. iv. 18; Mark ix. 26. Winer, p. 489.
[2] לֵאמֹר.
[3] Cf., besides, Winer, p. 560.
[4] Cf. ver. 2.
[5] Cf. καὶ δείξω, κ.τ.λ.
[6] C. a Lap., Beng., etc.
[7] Cf. on ver. 1.
[8] c. 4 in Schöttgen.
[9] Isa. vi.; Ezek. i.; Dan. vii. 9 sqq.; 1 Kings xxii. 29.
[10] Cf. also R. Rocholl, *Ueber Merkabah.*, *Zeitschr. f. Luther. Theolog.*, 1875, p. 393 sqq.

his head is placed a crown, and upon his brow a diadem with Schemhamphorasch. His eyes go through the whole earth; a part of them is fire, but a part hail. On his right is life; on his left, death; and a fiery sceptre is in his hand. Before him is stretched out a veil (פרכת), and seven angels who were created from the beginning minister before him within the veil. But that which is called פרגוד, and the footstool of his feet, are like fire and lightning, and shine beneath the throne of his glory like sapphire and fire. About his throne are righteousness and judgment. The place of his throne is that of the seven clouds surrounding him with glory; and the wheel of his chariot, and the cherub, and the living ones give to him glory. His throne is like sapphire, and at his feet are four living ones, each of whom has four faces, and as many wings. When God speaks from the east, this is done between the two cherubim with the face of a man; when from the south, then between the two cherubim with the face of a lion; when from the west, then between the two cherubim with the face of an ox; when from the north, then between the two cherubim with the face of an eagle. — The living ones also stand beside the throne of glory, yet they know not the place of his glory. The living ones stand also in fear and trembling, in horror and agitation, and from this agitation of their faces, a river of fire flows forth before them. Of the two seraphim, one stands at God's right hand, another at his left. Each has six wings; with two they cover their face, lest they may see the face of the shekinah; with two they cover their feet, lest the feet may see the shekinah, and immediately be able to find his footstep; but with two they fly, dread and sanctify his great name. One cries out, and another replies, saying, etc. — And the living ones stand beside his glory, yet they know not the place of his glory, but in every place where his glory is, they cry and say, Blessed be the glory of God in its place." — *θρόνος ἔκειτο.* The expression *κεῖσθαι* indicates neither an especial *breadth* of the throne,[1] nor that it rests upon the cherubim,[2] because the word here, as in Jer. xxiv. 1, LXX.; John ii. 6, xix. 29, and in the classics,[3] expresses the simple idea of "being placed."[4] — *καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον καθήμενος.* The mode of representation itself, according to which the reference here is to "one sitting," and in ver. 3,[5] the one mentioned in ver. 2 is described simply as "the sitting one," shows that John does not mention this sitting one more definitely, because he wishes here to do nothing more than with perfect fidelity to report the vision which he has had.[6] In i. 12 sqq., also, he has not expressly mentioned the manifestation of Christ. Utterly preposterous is the declaration of Heinr.: "The name seems to have been omitted only by carelessness in writing, which is especially conspicuous in this entire chapter." Just as impertinent is the allusion to the Jewish dread of uttering the name of God.[7] Suitable in itself to John would be the explanation of Herder: "To name him, the soul has no image, language no word;"[8] but even this is not here applicable, as John in general, even where

[1] Beng.
[2] Hengstenb. Cf. ver. 6.
[3] Cf. Meyer on John ii. 6.
[4] De Wette, Ebrard.
[5] Cf. ver. 11, v. 1.
[6] Cf. Hengstenb.
[7] Eichh., Ew.
[8] Cf. Aret., De Wette, etc.

he definitely mentions the vision here described, expressly calls God the enthroned one.[1] These passages show at the same time that the enthroned one is regarded [2] not as the Triune God,[3] but as God the Father, in distinction from the Son,[4] and the Spirit.[5] So Alcas., Stern, Grot., Wetst., Vitr., Beng., Hengstenb., etc.

Ver. 3. *ὁράσει.* Dative of manner:[6] "in appearance," cf. *ἡ ὄψις, κ.τ.λ.*, i. 16, and the *ὡς ὅρασις* with the following gen. of the object compared in the LXX. Ezek. i. 4, 26 sqq., viii. 2. — *λίθῳ ἰάσπιδι καὶ σαρδίῳ.* The *σάρδιος*[7] is, as the Heb. name indicates, a red,[8] particularly flesh-colored gem, our carnelian. Ebrard understands by it the dazzling ruby. — More difficult is the determination of the *ἴασπις.* The LXX. thus render the Heb. יָשְׁפֵה;[9] yet in this passage, as well as also in xxi. 11, where the *ἴασπις* is designated as *λίθος τιμιώτατος*, and *κρυσταλλίζων*, it is scarcely possible to think of the not very costly and not transparent, sometimes greenish, sometimes reddish gem, which the Romans called, as we also call it, jasper. Cf. Pliny:[10] "A gem, which, although surpassed by many, yet retains the glory of antiquity." Nevertheless, the most of the expositors adhere firmly to the simple expression. Andr., Areth., N. de Lyra, Aretius, etc., think of the *green* jasper, and understand it, just as the emerald mentioned immediately afterwards, as a symbol of divine consolation, since green is agreeable to the eye.[11] A symbolical reference has been discovered even to baptism,[12] and the judgment of the flood;[13] for the red sardius denotes the final judgment in fire. Others think of the *red* jasper, as they either regard it, like the sardius, a symbol of the divine anger,[14] or, without any such significance,[15] as only a description of the dazzling appearance of God. Beng., Stern., Hengstenb.,[16] presuppose a white, crystal-clear species of jasper, and find in this color the image of the divine holiness and unclouded glory. This sense of the brightness of color is indicated partly by emblematic descriptions, as Ezek. i. 4, viii. 2; Dan. vii. 9 sq.; and partly by parallels, as Apoc. i. 14 sqq., x. 1.[17] The brilliancy of light and fire is, in Ezekiel, the appearance of God. In Daniel, also, the bright white raiment and the dazzling white hair of the Ancient of days belong with the fire of his throne; for both the holy glory and the consuming anger of God[18] must be represented. Upon the same view depends the description of the Lord,[19] and of the angel, who in x. 1 appears invested with divine attributes, while, e.g., iv. 4, vii. 9, the heavenly beings, because they have attained to a holiness and glory like that of God, appear indeed in white garments, yet not also with the fiery signs of divine judgment, but with crowns and palms. If now the red appearance of the *σάρδιος*

[1] vii. 10, 15, xii. 5, xix. 4, xxii. 1.
[2] Cf. i. 1; 2 Cor. xiii. 13.
[3] N. de Lyra, C. a Lap., Calov.
[4] "The Lamb," v. 6 sqq.
[5] Cf. ver. 5.
[6] Erasm.
[7] xxi. 20. Cf. Ezek. xxviii. 17, xxxix. 10; LXX. for אֹדֶם.
[8] *πυρωπὸς τῷ εἴδει καὶ αἱματοειδής* ("fiery in appearance, and blood-red"), Epiphanius in Vitr.
[9] Exod. xxviii. 20, xxxix. 13; Ezek. xxviii. 13.
[10] *N. H.*, xxxvii. 37.
[11] N. de Lyra, etc.
[12] Aret.
[13] Victorin, Ticon., Primas, Beda.
[14] Vitr.
[15] Ew., De Wette, Ebrard.
[16] Cf. also Ew. ii.
[17] Cf. Hengstenb.
[18] Cf. also Deut. iv. 24.
[19] i. 14 sqq.

recalls the ardor of the divine wrathful judgment, we expect the ἴασπις to represent the bright light, which elsewhere is displayed along with the divine glimmering of fire, in a different way. But now the very bright or crystal-clear jasper, stated by Beng. and Hengstenb., does not actually exist. Hence we must believe, either that John imagined an ideal kind of jasper,[1] or, as is more probable, because of xxi. 11, that by the ἴασπις he wished to designate the diamond.[2] The LXX., in whose vocabulary John was instructed, do not have the term ἀδάμας.[3] The Heb. שָׁמִיר, which probably designates the diamond, is not accurately translated by the LXX. in Zech. vii. 12; Ezek. iii. 9.[4] It is, besides, to be observed, that the LXX. render not only יָשְׁפֵה, but also בָּרָקַת, Isa. liv. 12,[5] by ἴασπις. But if the description (ver. 3) depends upon Ezek. viii. 2 and similar passages, it yet in no way follows that here, as there,[6] the brilliancy of the two gems is to be regarded as different parts of the form of God, — the bright light of the jasper above, the red appearance of the sardius beneath:[7] rather, the double brilliancy of the two stones shining through one another[8] is to be regarded a profound designation of the essential unity of the holiness and righteousness of God. The free treatment of the ancient prophetic view expresses, as to the subject itself portrayed, a deepening of the thought; while the beauty of the likeness gains rather than loses, as the divine appearance to John maintains a pictorial unity. The entire form of the enthroned one appears in the twofold, yet united, brilliancy of the jasper and the sardius, just as the entire form of the Lord was in appearance like intense light of the sun.[9] — καὶ ἶρις κυκλόθεν τοῦ θρόνου ὅμοιος ὁράσει σμαραγδίνῳ. Concerning ὅμοιος as an adjective of two terminations, cf. Winer, p. 66. — Against the wording (κυκλ. τ. θρόνου) is the idea of Vitr., that the ἶρις surrounded the head of the one enthroned like a crown;[10] Beng. and Hengstenb. unnaturally and unfairly regard the ἶρις as surrounding the throne in breadth horizontally. — Hengstenb. infers, besides, from the formula κυκλ. τ. θρ. recurring from ver. 4, that also the thrones of the elders appear within the ἶρις; but it is the only natural and, in a pictorial respect, conceivable way, to regard the ἶρις as surrounding the shining form upon the throne on high.[11] — Without any basis is the controversy as to whether the ἶρις were a "rainbow,"[12] or a "bow;"[13] nor does it in any way correspond to the poetical character of the description, if, in order to explain the rainbow, mention is made of God's appearing, Ps. xviii. 12, civ. 3, surrounded by darkness of rain and thick clouds,[14] or that the green color here named is only the principal color,[15] as the hues of the jasper and sardius are regarded as combined with the brilliancy of the emerald, attributed to the

[1] Cf. xxi. 21. [2] Ebrard.

[3] Yet, at the time of John, the ἀδάμας was not unknown. Cf. Plin., *H. N.*, xxxvii. 15: "Among human things, not only among gems, the *adamas*, known only to kings, and these very few, had the greatest value. — Now six kinds of it are known: That of India, of a resemblance to crystal, since, also, it does not differ in translucency; the Cyprian, verging to the color of brass."

[4] Jer. xvii. 1 is lacking in the LXX.

[5] i.e., the probable ruby.

[6] Cf. also x. 1.

[7] Züll., Hengstenb.

[8] Ebrard. [9] i. 16. [10] Cf. x. 1.

[11] Ebrard, and my exp.

[12] So translated by most.

[13] Ebrard.

[14] De Wette.

[15] Grot., Eichh., Stern, Hengstenb., etc.

ἶρις, in order to bring out the three chief colors of one common rainbow. What John saw about the throne had the form of a rainbow, — hence he says ἶρις, — although not the seven colors of an actual rainbow are represented, but only the emerald green. Yet this ἶρις in itself, and the emerald appearance especially,[1] are not without symbolical significance, possibly in a mere optical contrast with the blending brilliancy of the jasper and sardius;[2] but in symmetry with the symbolical significance of this twofold brilliancy, the mild emerald-green of the bow, which is already in itself the clear sign of divine grace,[3] notes the gentle and quickening nature of this grace.[4] But it follows neither from the gen., nor from the pragmatism of this passage, that the grace *recurring* after the divine punishments [5] is described; it would be more correctly interpreted with Grot.: "God in his judgments is always mindful of his covenant." Yet we dare not precipitately limit the description here presented, in its particular connections, to the judgments of God in their relation to divine grace which are to be beheld only later: it is sufficient that here where the eternal and personal foundation of all that follows is portrayed, the holy glory and righteousness of God appear in most intimate union with his immutable and kind grace, so that thus the entire impending development of the kingdom of God and the world unto its last end, as it is determined by that wonderful, indivisible nature of the holy, just, and gracious God, as well in its course as in its goal, must correspond to this threefold glory of the living God. Consequently this fundamental vision contains every thing that serves the terror of enemies, and the consolation of friends, of the one enthroned.

Ver. 4. The twenty-four elders whom John sees sitting [6] on the twenty-four thrones standing about the throne of God [7] are, in like manner, the heavenly representatives of the entire people of God; as, in Isa. xxiv. 23, the elders are regarded the earthly heads and representatives of the entire Church.[8] For, that these twenty-four elders are *human*, and not a "selection of the entire host of heaven," [9] nor angels,[10] is decided by their designation, that which is ascribed to them (white robes and crowns), and the entire mode of their employment.[11] They are neither the "bishops" or "prefects of the entire church," [12] nor priests,[13] nor "the entire assembly of ministers

[1] Cf. Plin., *N. H.*, xxxvii. 5: "Nay, even from another intention, the dimmed sight is refreshed by the sight of the emerald; and, to those cutting gems, there is no more grateful treat to the eyes, than thus to soothe their weariness by its green mildness."

[2] Ebrard. Cf. Ew., De Wette.

[3] Gen. ix. 12 sqq.

[4] Cf. N. de Lyra, Aret., Grot., Calov., Beng., Herd., Hengstenb., etc. [On the spiritual significance of the rainbow, see the beautiful poem of Carl Gerock, in his *Die Symphonie der Farben* of his *Der letzte Strauss*, 1885.]

[5] Stern, Hengstenb.

[6] Cf. xi. 16, ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ.

[7] The acc. πρεσβυτέρους depends upon a self-evident εἶδον (De Wette).

[8] In reference to this passage, the *Tanchuma*, p. 48, 1 (in Schöttg.), says: "In the future, God ascribes glory to the elders. — Our rabbins also have said: 'God will make for himself an assembly of our elders.'" So, too (at p. 52 in Hengstenb.), according to Dan. vii. 9, "In the future, God will sit, and the angels will give seats to the magnates of Israel, and they sit. And God sits with his elders, as the president of a senate, and will judge the Gentiles."

[9] Rinck. [10] Hofm.

[11] Cf. v. 5, vii. 13.

[12] N. de Lyra, who, in their twenty-four seats finds, at the same time, all the cathedral churches portrayed.

[13] Zeger.

of the word,"[1] nor "all true rectors and faithful pastors of the N. T. Church,"[2] nor Christian martyrs;[3] but simply the representatives of the entire congregation of all believers, to whom, as to these elders, belong the holiness and glory indicated by the white robes,[4] and the royal dominion by the thrones and crowns.[5] The number twenty-four is not derived from the orders of priests, 1 Cor. xxvi.,[6] for the question here is in no respect concerning priests; and still less[7] is it to be regarded as a type of the elders of the church at Jerusalem, for the idea that this church had just twenty-four elders is without any foundation. All those expositors are in the right way who, proceeding from the number twelve, attempt to indicate a doubling of it. As now, undoubtedly, the simple as well as the doubled twelve[8] has particular reference to the twelve tribes of the O. T. Church, the twenty-four elders cannot be twelve apostles and twelve martyrs;[9] but also the explanation that from each of the twelve tribes two representatives are regarded as standing, one on the right, the other on the left of the throne of God,[10] is of itself unimportant and arbitrary. It is possible[11] only to regard the twofold twelve, either the representatives of the O. and the N. T. Church,[12] or the representatives of the Church gathered not only from the Jews, but also from the Gentiles.[13] Against the latter, Hengstenb. and Ebrard incorrectly say that the mode of view in the Apoc. is not conformable to that of the entire N. T.; for also in vii. 9 sqq., those saved from the heathen are distinguished from those from the twelve tribes (vii. 4 sqq.), and that, too, without detriment to the view according to which the heathen are added to Israel. Yet the former explanation of the twelve representatives of the churches of the O. and N. T. is to be preferred, because this in itself, and according to intimations like xv. 3 (the song of *Moses* and the *Lamb*), is more immediate, and because, by this mode of statement, the twenty-four elders appearing in *personal* definitiveness can the more appropriately represent the O. and N. T. Churches. To wit, not "the twelve tribes," as De Wette inconsistently explains, but the twelve personal heads of the Church of the O. T., composed of twelve tribes, i.e., the twelve patriarchs, are comprised in thought together with the twelve apostles, the N. T. antitypes to the patriarchs.[14] [See Note XLII., p. 202.] The objections made against the holiness of the twelve patriarchs[15] are in no way pertinent,—as they

[1] Calov. [3] Vitr.

[2] Eichh.

[4] Cf. on ver. 3.

[5] xx. 4, i. 6, iii. 21. Cf. Primas, Aret., C. a Lap., Beng., Herd., De Wette, Stern, Hengstenb., Ebrard, etc.

[6] Zeger, Vitr., Eichh., Ew. i., Hilgenf.

[7] Grot.

[8] Or, elsewhere, the quadruple. Cf. vii. 4 sqq., xiv. 3.

[9] Joachim.

[10] Heinr.

[11] The explanation of Volkm., that the subject here is the representation of teacher and hearer as parts of the Christian Church having an equal title, is very remote. Klief.: The number twelve, the sign of the people of God, is doubled "because the blessed people of God assembled in heaven have increased, and daily increase, by those added to believers from all nations." But, in connection with this, he rejects the distinction between Jewish and Gentile Christianity, made only by modern theologians in violation of Scripture.

[12] Andr., Areth., Aret., C. a Lap., Bossuet, Stern, Hengstenb., Ebrard.

[13] Bleek, De Wette. Cf. also Heinr.

[14] Cf. xxi. 12, 14; Andr., Areth., Hengstenb., Ebrard.

[15] De Wette, according to Joach.

could also be urged against the apostles, — because the patriarchs come into consideration not according to their own conduct or individual worth, but as the favored chiefs of the tribes of the O. T. people.

Ver. 5. The throne of God corresponds in its appearance to the majesty of the king sitting thereon. As in Ps. xxix.,[1] the regal[2] omnipotence of God is made visible in the violence of the thunder-storm, so John here uses the same image in order to describe the unlimited omnipotence of the enthroned one, particularly as exercised in judgment. The throne itself, out of which proceeded "the lightnings, thunderings, and voices," appears filled with this sign of the Divine omnipotence. The *φωναί* which are here distinguished from the *βρονταί* — so that passages as vi. 1, x. 3, xiv. 2,[3] must not be here compared, — have[4] to be regarded as the roar which in a storm accompanies the thunder and lightning.[5] The misunderstandings of the description depend upon the crudeness and arbitrariness of the exposition. So in N. de Lyra:[6] "The coruscation of miracles, and declaration of rewards for good and the terror of punishments for evil deeds." Solely on account of the *ἐκπορεύονται*,[7] Aretius understood by the *ἀστραπ.*, *φων.*, and *βροντ.*, even, the Holy Ghost. De Wette[8] discerns in the lightning, etc., figures of God's manifestations of power and life in nature, which are to be distinguished, as "critical and powerful revelations of God," from the *seven lamps* as "his calm and perpetual influences;" while in vv. 6–8, "nature itself, or the realm of the living," and finally in vv. 9–11, "the harmony of creation with redeemed humanity, and thus God in his living efficiency and reality," are brought into consideration. But this interpretation is in more than one respect without foundation. The lightning, voices, and thunder are, according to the O. T. view, on which the present description depends,[9] not figures of the revelation of God in *nature* as distinct from another revelation, but of the unlimited power of God, especially as judging;[10] only we dare not, with Grot., understand the *ἀστρ.* and *βροντ.* of general threats, but the *φων.* of particular afflictions. The throne whence the lightning, etc., proceeds, agrees with that whose form appears to be not only like jasper, but also like a *sardine* stone. — *καὶ ἑπτὰ λαμπάδες πυρὸς, κ.τ.λ.* The authentic explanation immediately follows: *αἱ εἰσι τὰ ἑπτὰ πνεύματα τοῦ θεοῦ.* Cf., besides, i. 4. The pragmatic significance of the Spirit of God in this connection is not that the Spirit of God "is the principle of the psychical[11] and spiritual life, and that through him the inner influence of God on nature and the human world occurs;"[12] for the idea of the *λαμπάδες πυρός* does not suit the explanation of the closely connected first half of the verse. But Hengstenb. also, who very arbitrarily combines the "seven" of the Spirit with the "three" of the lightning, voices, and thunder, into a "ten," and herein finds indicated a connection of the Spirit with that lightning, etc., improperly thinks only of

1 Cf. Ps. xcvii. 1 sqq., xviii. 8 sqq.
2 Ps. xxix. 10.
3 Hengstenb.
4 Cf. Exod. xix. 16.
5 Cf. Vitr., Ew., Hengstenb.
6 Cf. already Primas, Beda; also Zeger.
7 Cf. John xv. 26.
8 Cf. also Ebrard.
9 Cf. viii. 5, xi. 19, xvi. 18.
10 Vitr., Hengstenb., etc.
11 Gen. i. 2; Ps. civ. 30.
12 De Wette, Ebrard.

an operation of the Spirit, "bringing corruption, punishing, and annihilating." If also the idea of the work of the Spirit in judging[1] dare not be left out of consideration, partly because of what precedes, and partly because of the expression πυρός; on the one hand, the expression λαμπάδες, and, on the other, the parallel v. 6 (ὀφθαλμοί), indicate that the Spirit is to be regarded chiefly as illuminating, seeing, searching all things,[2] and just on that account everywhere[3] active in his holy judgments. Essentially the seven lamps of fire burning before the throne of God indicate nothing else than the eyes of the Lord "as a flame of fire" in i. 14.[4]

Ver. 6. ὡς θάλασσα ὑαλίνη, ὁμοία κρυστάλλῳ. The ὡς — which[5] belongs to the entire idea, and not chiefly to the ὑαλίνη[6] — stands here just as in viii. 8. What John further beheld before the throne of God appeared as a sea of glass like crystal. This is regarded as signifying baptism,[7] the Holy Scriptures,[8] repentance,[9] the present transitory world,[10] etc., — all purely arbitrary. Without ground, further, is the allusion to the "brazen sea" in the temple,[11] or to the bright inlaid floor, having, therefore, the appearance of a sea.[12] It is in general a conception not justified by the text, to regard the "sea of glass" the basis of the throne, as C. a Lap., Vitr., Eichh., Heinr., Herder, De Wette, etc., presuppose, who from this same idea reach interpretations that are very different. With an appeal to Exod. xxiv. 10, Ezek. i. 26, De Wette[13] regards "the sea of glass" in our passage, as well as also in xv. 2, as a designation of "the atmosphere," an explanation to which, in its pure naturalness, Exodus and Ezekiel do not apply, — where, however, in reality the pure ether is the natural substratum for the idea of the standing or enthronement of God in heavenly glory, — while in this passage the sea of glass is not *beneath*, but *before*, the throne of God, and the entire presentation is altogether foreign to "the atmosphere." On the other hand, Vitr., Herder, etc., with a reference to Ps. lxxxix. 15, and similar passages, interpret the sea of glass as the basis of righteousness and grace, whereon the throne of God is founded.[14] Following Beng., Hengstenb. has understood the sea of glass, since it appears in xv. 2 mingled with fire, as the "*product* of the seven lamps of fire," since and because of the expression "sea" referring to Ps. xxxvi. 7, as a designation of "the great and wonderful works of God, of his just and holy ways, of his acts of righteousness that have become manifest." But already the parallelism of v. 6, where these seven lamps appear as seven eyes, in itself renders this artificial interpretation impossible. — Aret., Grot., and Ebrard proceed upon the fact that the sea, viz., as stormy

[1] Cf. Isa. iv. 4; John xvi. 8.
[2] Cf. 1 Cor. ii. 10.
[3] Cf. v. 6; Ps. cxxxix. 7.
[4] Cf. Dan. x. 6.
[5] Cf. also xv. 2.
[6] Beng.
[7] Victorin., Tichon., Primas, Beda, N. de Lyra, Hoë, Calov.
[8] Joachim.
[9] Alcas.
[10] Par., Bull., Rib.
[11] Alcas., Alsted.
[12] Ew., with a comparison of the Koran, *Sur.* 27, 44.
[13] Cf. Eichh., etc.
[14] Vitr.: "A *will* of God, sure and perpetual, whereby he determined to have, among men, a kingdom of grace; a *right* sure and clear to erect such a kingdom of grace, in the *righteousness* and obedience of the mediator; this very *right* founded in the *righteousness of Christ* is the basis of the throne."

and irregularly heaving (xiii. 1), represents the mass of the nations in their ungodly state; and then, that the sea of glass, clear as crystal, and therefore firm as well as pure, designates "the creature in its pure relation to the Creator."[1] But this interpretation is wrecked on xv. 2. According to that passage,[2] the sea, whose complete, heavenly purity is marked by the double designation, ὑαλ. and ὁμ. κρυστ.,[3] is to be regarded identical with the stream of the water of life, which[4] proceeds from the throne of God.[5] The point thus designated belongs in fact essentially to the perfection of the view of the enthroned God; and according to the living relation in which the vision, ch. iv. [and v.], stands to all that follows, it is to be expected, that, as the succeeding judgments appear as the work of the holy and just omnipotence of the heavenly King here described, so also a definite point of the present fundamental description corresponds to the final glorious and blessed completion of the kingdom of God. Since in the presence of God there is fulness of joy,[6] since God is the Blessed One,[7] since before him and from him issues the river of eternal life, he himself, and communion with him, is the blessed goal for the development of his kingdom, and he himself is the leader thereto. [See Note XLIII., p. 203.] καὶ ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ θρόνου καὶ κύκλῳ τοῦ θρόνου τέσσαρα ζῶα, κ.τ.λ. The four beings[8] appear not as supporting the throne, for ἐν μέσῳ τ. θρ. is by no means "*under* the throne;"[9] also not as stated by Eichh., Ew. i., and Hengstenb., that the four ζῶα are stationed with the back under the throne, but with the upper part projecting therefrom so raised above the same that they could appear as being "round about" the throne — an idea which because of its absolute deformity ought not to have been forced upon John. In like manner impossible is Ebrard's opinion, that[10] the four ζῶα are in the midst of the (transparent!) throne, but that *at the same time* they had moved themselves with the rapidity of lightning from the same, so that they appeared also around about the throne. Incorrect also is Vitr., who makes of ἐν μέσ. and κυκλ. a strange hendiadys: "In the midst of the semicircular area which was before the throne." According to the wording of the text, the position of the four beings is not to be regarded else than as is most natural in connection with their fourfold number, viz., one on each side of the throne, and besides each in the midst of its respective side.[11] They stand so free as to be able to move;[12] and because they have manifestly turned with their faces towards the throne, John can see that they are "full of eyes before and behind."[13] There is no occasion whatever for the conjecture that the words καὶ ἐν μέσῳ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων might have belonged in the text.[14]

[1] Ebrard; Aretius: "The assembly of the triumphing Church." Grot., in his way: "The people of Jerusalem." The ὑαλίνη and ὁμ. κρυστ.: "Because God perceives the actions and thoughts of the people;" but also "because of the purity of the people of Jerusalem." Klief.: "The multitude of the blessed conquerors from all times and nations on earth, preserved in heaven with God unto the end, who are represented by the twenty-four elders." And this with an appeal to xv. 2.

[2] Cf. also xxii. 1.

[3] Id.

[4] Id.

[5] Cf. Rinck.

[6] Cf. Ps. xvi. 11.

[7] Cf. 1 Tim. i. 11.

[8] Cf., concerning their meaning, ver. 8.

[9] Hengstenb.

[10] Cf. Ezek. i. 4, 5, 14.

[11] Züll. Cf. De Wette.

[12] xv. 7.

[13] See on ver. 8.

[14] Ew. ii.: "Between the chief seat and the elders."

Ver. 7. While, in Ezekiel,[1] the forms of the four cherubim [2] bear in wonderful combination the fourfold faces of the lion, the ox, the man, and the eagle, John with more distinct clearness has so seen the four beings that in each of them only a part of that fourfold form is expressed. In this, also, he is distinguished from Ezekiel, that he represents his "four beings," not each with four but with six wings, as the seraphim in Isa. vi.; yet, on the other hand, John agrees with Ezekiel, that in him the wings, as well as the whole body, appear full of eyes (ver. 8). — The second being is like a *μόσχος*, i.e., not a "calf" in distinction from a grown ox, but, as is already required in an æsthetic respect, the ox. The LXX. have *μόσχος*, Ezek. i. 10, for שׁוֹר;[3] also Ezek. xxi. 37;[4] Lev. xxii. 23. But they render thus also the words פָּר,[5] עֵגֶל[6] and בָּקָר.[7] By *μόσχος*, therefore, only some animal of that class is designated; the more precise determination is given by the context. — The third *ζῶον* has *τὸ πρόσωπον*[8] *ἀνθρώπου*. In Ezekiel the chief form of the cherubim is human; this has been adopted also by Vitr. and Hengstenb. for the Apoc.[9] On the contrary, Beng. infers from the words *ἐχ. τ. πρόσωπον, κ.τ.λ.*: "So it did not have in other respects the form of a man." Ebrard is right in being contented with not knowing more than is said in the text. In the third being, however, the human *face* is characteristic; just as in the eagle, to which the fourth being is like, not so much the form in itself, as the flying, is significant, and therefore marked.

Ver. 8. The four beings, having each six wings,[9] are all around and within full of eyes. Concerning the composition *ἓν καθ'. ἓν*, cf. Mark xiv. 19; John viii. 9; Rom. xii. 15; Winer, p. 234. Concerning the distributive *ἀνά*, cf. John ii. 6; Winer, p. 372. — The *κυκλόθεν* belongs not to what precedes,[10] but with *ἔσωθεν* to *γέμουσιν*. Yet the *κυκλόθεν* is not equivalent to the *ἔμπροσθεν*, ver. 6, so that the *ἔσωθεν* corresponds to the *ὄπισθεν*;[11] but rather the *κυκλόθεν* properly comprises already both of those statements, while only with reference to the wings mentioned is it still expressly remarked that "within," i e., on the inner side of the wings, under them — not only round about the entire outside of the body (*κυκλ.*) — all is full of eyes.[12] It results also from this determination of *κυκλ.* and *ἔσωθεν*, that the declaration *γεμ. ὀφθαλμ.* is repeated, because this is to be extended particularly[13] to the wings.[14] At the same time the adding of what follows, *καὶ ἀνάπαυσιν — ἐρχόμενος*, reveals the meaning first of the fulness of eyes, and then of the four beings in general. Ceaselessly, day and night, they exclaim, "Holy," etc. — The masc. *λέγοντες*, in the same loose way as ver. 1. — The *ἡμ. κ. νυκτ.* can in no way

[1] Ch. i. 10.

[2] Cf. E. Riehm, *De Natura et Notione Symbolica Cheruborum*, Bas. et Ludov., 1864, p. 23. Cf. also *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1871, p. 399 sq.; Lämmert, *D. Cherubim der H. Schrift.*, Jahrb. f. Deutsche Theologie, Gotha, 1867, p. 587 sq., 609 sq.; L. Seeburg, *Die Sage von den Greifen bei den Alten; St. 1: Ueber d. Ursprung der Sage und ihre Verbreitung im Oriente*, Göttinger Inaugural-Dissertat. (1867), pp. 7, 32 sq.

[3] Ezek. i. 7, as it refers to the feet of the cherubim, does not belong here.

[4] LXX., xxii. 1.

[5] Exod. xxix. 10.

[6] Exod. xxxii. 4.

[7] Gen. xii. 16.

[8] *ὡς*. See Critical Remarks.

[9] Cf. v. 8, xix. 4, where the beasts fall down, "which cannot be thought of if two of them were four-footed."

[10] Luther.

[11] "Within, towards the throne."

[12] Züll., De Wette.

[13] De Wette.

[14] Cf. Ezek. x. 12.

suggest that at the throne of God there is no change of day and night, and still less dare the explanation be made: "Though there be on earth, here or there, day or night."[1] — The uninterrupted hymn of praise of the four beings sounds like that of the seraphim in Isa. vi. 3; but since, instead of the close found there (*πλήρης πᾶσα ἡ γῆς τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ*), it is said here *ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος*, there is found[2] in the praise of these four beings a particular factor, which already in i. 8 sounds forth like a keynote in a judgment of God which is highly significant to the whole. The thrice holy Lord God, at the same time, is also the Eternal One *who is to come*. These words of praise from the mouth of the four beings agree perfectly with the manifestation of the Enthroned One,[3] as this itself agrees with his own words;[4] and in all the living divine foundation of the entire Apocalyptic prophecy is indicated, because God "comes" — in a personal way, as the prophet says — as surely as he is the Holy, Almighty, Eternal One, endowed with complete living energy. — Only now can the question be answered, as to what these beings are, and what their special characteristics signify. Undoubtedly these four *ζῶα*[5] are not actual beasts who serve only to support the throne of God, as in Persian and Indian sculptures massive forms of beasts are seen supporting a throne;[6] for *ζῶον* is not *θηρίον*,[7] and concerning the four beings as *supporting* the throne, the text does not say a word. — Almost all the explanations of older times depend upon mere surmises, as, that the four beings are meant to designate: the Four Evangelists, and that, too, so that, according to Augustine,[8] the lion represents Matthew, the man Mark, the ox Luke, and the eagle John;[9] the four cardinal virtues;[10] the four mysteries of faith, viz., Christ's incarnation, passion, resurrection, ascension;[11] the four patriarchal churches;[12] the four apostles or apostolic men, who were then at Jerusalem as standard-bearers of Christ's camp;[13] all the doctors of the Church,[14] etc. It is further a perversion to regard the four beings as angels, from whom they are expressly distinguished in v. 8, 11, vii. 11.[15] According to their form, they are essentially identical with the cherubim of the O. T.; so they have also their symbolical meaning. The question is

[1] Beng.

[2] As it corresponds with the pragmatic relation of the entire presentation, ch. iv. [and v.], to the entire contents of the Apoc.

[3] Ver. 2 sqq.

[4] i. 8.

[5] חַיּוֹת, Ezek. i. Cf. especially ver. 20, where all four חַיּוֹת are designated as *one* חַיָּה; here the LXX., incorrectly, *ζωή*.

[6] Eichh., Ew.

[7] Wis. vii. 20.

[8] *De Cons. Evang.*, 16.

[9] Cf. Victor, Primas, Beda, Andr. Even Ebrard attributes some truth to such forced interpretation.

[10] Andr., Areth.

[11] Aretius after Augustine, Ansbertus.

[12] N. de Lyra: Jerusalem (where the church began, is the *first* beast, Acts v. 29 furnishing an example of its lion-like spirit), Antioch, Alexandria, and Constantinople. The six wings are the natural law, the Mosaic law, the oracles of the prophets, the gospel of counsels, the doctrine of the apostles, the statutes of general councils. The station of the Romish Church, which is naturally already, in N. de Lyra, the head of all, C. a Lap. describes by adding "that the throne of God is the *cathedra Romana*, on which sits the vicar of Christ."

[13] Grot., who regards them as Peter, James, Matthew, and Paul; the "eyes" are colors, and designate the multiform gifts of God.

[14] The doctors of theology. Calov.; Cf. Vitr., etc.

[15] Cf. Vitr. and Hengstenb., *vs.* Laun., C. a Lap., Beng., etc.

whether they represent *powers* of God employed in the creation,[1] or *creation* itself.[2] The former interpretation is carried to such extent by Ebrard, that the lion is regarded as designating the consuming and destroying, the bullock the nourishing, man the thinking and caring, and the eagle, which soars victoriously above all, the preserving and rejuvenating power in nature. This is indeed ingenious, but is forced. It is in itself peculiar, and entirely unbiblical, to form the *powers* of God into definite symbolical beings, and the idea is entirely inadmissible, to regard *powers* so formed as proclaiming the praise of God: but, on the other hand, it is perfectly natural for the *works* to proclaim the praise of the Creator,[3] and for these, especially the entire living creation, to be represented by definite, concrete forms. The creatures at the basis of the O. T. cherubic forms most simply offer themselves as such representatives of the entire living creation. The correct point of view is already stated in the rabbinical sentence:[4] "There are four holding the chief place in the world, — among creatures, man; among birds, the eagle; among cattle, the ox; among beasts, the lion." That these four are intended to represent the *entire* living creation, is indicated by the significant number four itself;[5] and to object against it, that besides the fish, etc., are not represented, is pointless.[6] Entirely irrelevant, however, to the proper meaning of the symbol, is the succession of lion, ox, etc., which John, after remodelling in general the Ezekiel cherubic forms, unintentionally changed; the idea also is arbitrary, that the four beings in John, just as in Ezekiel, must have had altogether *human bodies*, since man is exalted above other creatures.[7] This allusion is introduced here without sufficient reason, as the subject has to do simply with the entirety of the living creation as such. Incorrect, besides, is the interpretation of the eyes, wherewith the four beings are covered, by saying that the entire living creation is "spiritualized,"[8] which follows at least from v. 6. The context itself shows, on the other hand, that the eyes are to be regarded as signs of the constant wakefulness day and night, belonging to the ceaseless praise of God.[9] Finally, the six wings which John has derived for his beings from the six seraphim (Isa. vi.), we cannot well understand here otherwise than as there. They designate not the collective significance of the four beings,[10] but serve as a figurative representation of the unconditionally dependent and ministerial relation in which the creature stands, and is recognized as standing, to its Creator. Thus Bengel:[11] "So that with two they covered their faces, with two their feet, and with two flew: whereby then the three chief virtues were indicated, viz., reverence or respect, as they do not boldly look; humility, as they hide themselves before that brilliancy; and obedience, to execute commands." — The essential idea delineated in the images of the ζῶα (cherubim)

[1] Ebrard, etc.

[2] Herder, De Wette, Rinck, Hengstenb.

[3] Cf. Ps. xix. 2 sqq., ciii. 22, cxlviii.

[4] Schemoth, *Rabba* 23, fol. 122, 4, b. Schöttg. Cf. also Beng.

[5] Beng., Hengstenb. [6] Ebrard.

[7] "The human type must preponderate in the personification of every thing living; the rest must be content with the representation of their faces" (Hengstenb.).

[8] Hengstenb.

[9] De Wette. Cf. Rinck, etc.

[10] Rinck, who mentions that the entire number of wings, four times six, is equal the number of elders.

[11] Cf. also Hengstenb.

may be expressed in words as Ps. ciii. 22: "All the works of God (in all places)," — as they, at least with respect to earthly living creatures, are represented in the beings, and that, too, *four* beings, — are to "praise God in all places of his dominion." For, that he, as unconditioned Lord of his creatures, is honored with all humility and obedience, is seen in that they hide themselves, and are ready to serve his will. Yet there is also placed in the mouth of the representatives of the creatures an express ascription of praise to the holy, almighty Lord, and that, too, as the innumerable, ever-wakeful eyes show, one that is perpetual (ver. 8). [See Note XLIV., p. 203.]

Vv. 9–11. The ascription of praise to God by the representatives of the creation, viz., the four beasts, is joined by that of the twenty-four elders, the representatives of redeemed humanity;[1] yet here the praise of the elders (ver. 11) refers not to redemption itself, — which first occurs in v. 9 sq., — but to the power and glory of God revealed in creation, so that the words of the elders stand in beautiful harmony with the praise of the four beings, as well as with the significance of the entire vision; of course not without the relation expressly indicated in ver. 8, and lying at the basis, that Almighty God, who has made the beginning of all things, will also bring them to a completion.

Ver. 9. *ὅταν δώσουσι.* The fut., instead of the regular sub.,[2] does not present a conception that is strictly future,[3] but has, like the Heb. imperfect, the force of a frequentative: "when, as often as."[4] — *δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν.* Viz., the worshipful acknowledgment of the glory and honor[5] belonging to the Lord;[6] while by *καὶ εὐχαριστίαν* is designated immediately, and without metonymy, the thanksgiving[7] rendered by the creature. — *τῷ καθημένῳ — αἰώνων.* So God calls the enthroned God very similarly as the four beasts praise him, and in the same respect. Hence, also on cemore in ver. 10, the same designation of God, comprising the reason for the praise, and the ground of all hope and prophecy. — On ver. 10, cf. v. 8, xix. 4. The casting-down of the crowns is, together with the falling down and worshipping, the sign of humiliation before the King and Lord, in whose presence no creature whatever has any glory or honor of its own.[8]

Ver. 11. Not without significance, the elders who, as representatives of the redeemed, stand in a still closer relation to their Lord and God than the four beings, address the Enthroned One: *ὁ κυρ. καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν.*[9] — *ἄξιος εἶ λαβεῖν.* Cf. v. 12. That God not only when he is worshipped, but also when he exterminates his enemies, receives glory,[10] does not belong here. — *τὴν δοξ., κ.τ λ.*, the elders say, because in replying they look back in a certain respect to ver. 8.[11] — *καὶ τὴν δύναμιν.* While the representatives

[1] Cf. De Wette, Hengstenb., Ebrard.

[2] Winer, p. 289 sq.

[3] From now, and to all the future. Cf. vii. 15 sq. It is not so earlier, because only since the work of redemption is in progress, and the victory of Christ in development, are the twenty-four elders in this position and occupation. De Wette; cf. Stern.

[4] Vitr., Beng., Hengstenb., Ebrard, etc.

[5] Cf. Ps. xxix. 1, xcvi. 7. Hengstenb., etc.

[6] Cf. i. 6.

[7] Hengstenb.

[8] Cf. Tacit., *Annal.*, xv. 29: "To which (statue of Nero) Tiridates, having advanced, cast before the image the diadem removed from his head."

[9] See Critical Notes.

[10] Beng. Cf. xi. 17.

[11] Beng.

of even creation are right in offering *thanks* (ver. 8), especially suitable in the mouth of the elders, who although naturally also belonging to creation, yet with a certain objectivity regard the work of creation (ὅτι σὺ ἔκτισας, κ.τ.λ.), is the thankful acknowledgment of the *power* of the Creator revealed therein.[1] — καὶ διὰ τὸ θέλημά σου ἦσαν. The Vulg., correctly: "On account of thy will." Luther, incorrectly: "Through thy will." Concerning διὰ with the accus. to designate the ground, not the means, cf. John vi. 57; Winer, p. 372. — In regard to ἦσαν, the reference may be considered impossible: "In thy disposition from eternity, before they were created;"[2] and just as little dare the ἐκτίσθησαν be applied to regeneration through Christ,[3] if the ἦσαν be correctly referred to the creation. Bengel's explanation of the ἦσαν: "All things *were*, from the creation to the time of this ascription of praise, and still henceforth. Hereby the *preservation* of all created things is praised," is also artificial; while his explanation of ἐκτίσθησαν: "Since thou hast created all things, they remain as long as thou wilt have them," is utterly incorrect. The ἦσαν is taken mostly[4] as synonymous with ἐκτίσθησαν; but ἦσαν is not equivalent to ἐγένοντο or ἐγενήθησαν.[5] On the contrary, after the divine work of creation is mentioned (ἔκτισας), the idea recurs to the same point with vivid clearness: as all things *were*, which before were not. The καὶ ἐκτίσθησαν is, then, not synonymous with the ἦσαν, but presents expressly the precise fact upon which the ἦσαν depends: "they were created." Thus the lauded work of the Creator (σὺ ἔκτισας) is made manifest even to the creatures by the idea in its two modifications of the ἦσαν and ἐκτίσθησαν.

Notes by the American Editor.

XLII. Ver. 4. εἴκοσι τέσσαρας πρεσβυτέρους.

Gebhardt, however (p. 48), urges against this view advocated by Düsterdieck, "the fact, that, on the gates of the New Jerusalem, the names of the twelve tribes — the names of the patriarchs — are written; and, on its foundations, the names of the twelve apostles (xxi. 12, 14); but neither on the gates, nor on the foundation, do we find the two associated. It is entirely foreign to the thoughts of the seer, to conceive of the two side by side with each other. They are the same, but one as the type, the other the fulfilment. The song of Moses and the Lamb (xv. 3), which is quoted in favor of this interpretation, is neither a double song, nor is it sung by O. and N. T. believers; it is one, and ascends from the lips of conquerors in the Christian life." He argues that the elders are not concrete realities, "but, as the living creatures are a symbolical representation of the animated creation of God in general, according to its ideal, so are the elders a symbolical representation of the people of God, according to their ideal, or, in other words, of redeemed humanity." Luthardt: "Not possibly the twelve patriarchs and the twelve apostles, or, in general, the representatives of the Church; for they are distinguished from believers, v. 10 (according to the correct reading), vii. 9 sqq., 14, xi. 16 sqq.; and the glorified

[1] Cf. Rom. i. 20.
[2] N. de Lyra.
[3] Grot.
[4] "They came into being:" De Wette. Cf. C. a Lap., Elchh., Herd., Hengstenb., Ebrard.
[5] Ps. xxxiii. 9.

as yet wear no crowns, but are expecting only the time of dominion (ii. 10–vi. 9); but it is the heavenly council, composed of representatives of the people of God in heaven."

XLIII. Ver. 6. *θάλασσα ὑαλίνη.*

Alford objects to our author's identification of the "sea of glass" with the "river of water of life;" for "the whole vision there [xxii. 1] is quite distinct from this, and each one has its own propriety in detail. To identify the two is to confound them, nor does ch. xv. 2 at all justify this interpretation. There, as here, it is the purity, calmness, and majesty of God's rule which are signified by the figure." Luthardt, on the other hand, in substantial agreement with Düst.: "The fulness of the divine life (cf. xxii. 1), which is nothing but peace and calm, in contrast with the stormy disquietude of the life of the world (xiii. 1; Dan. vii. 2)."

XLIV. Vv. 6–8. *τέσσερα ζῷα.*

Cf. Cremer (*Lexicon*): "Properly, *a living creature*, which also occurs elsewhere also in profane Greek, where *ζῷον*, a post-Homeric word, generally signifies *living creature*, and only in special instances a beast; *θηρίον* = animal, as embracing all living beings, must be retained in the Revelation, where four *ζῷα* are represented as being between God's throne and those of the elders which surround it, the description given of which (Rev. iv. 6–8) resembles that of the חיות in Ezek. i. 5 sqq.; the cherubim in Ezek. x. (cf. Ps. xviii. 1, xcix. 1, lxxx. 2; 1 Sam. iv. 4; 2 Sam. vi. 2; 2 Kings xix. 15). They are named living creatures here and in Ezek. i., on account of *the life* which is their main feature. They are usually the signs and tokens of majesty, of the sublime majesty of God, both in his covenant relation, and in his relation to the world (for the latter, see Ps. xcix. 1); and therefore it is that they are assigned so prominent a place, though no active part in the final scenes of sacred history (Rev. vi. 1–7). The appearance of four represents the concentration of all created life in this world, the original abode of which, Paradise, when life had fallen to sin and death, was given over to the cherubim. They do not, like the angels, fulfil the purposes of God in relation to men; they are distinct from the angels (Rev. v. 11). We are thus led to conclude that they materially represent the ideal pattern of the true relation of creation to its God." Oehler (*O. T. Theology*, p. 260): "It is the cherubim, as Schultz well expresses it, 'which at one and the same time *proclaim* and veil his presence.' The lion and the bull are, as is well known, symbols of power and strength; man and the eagle are symbols of wisdom and omniscience; the latter attribute is expressed also in the later form of the symbol by the multitude of eyes. The continual mobility of the *ζῷα* (Rev. iv. 8) signifies the never-resting quickness of the Divine operations; this is probably symbolized also by the wheels in Ezek. i. The number *four* is the signature of all-sidedness (towards the four quarters of heaven). Thus Jehovah is acknowledged as the God who rules the world on all sides in power, wisdom, and omniscience. Instead of natural powers working unconsciously, is placed the all-embracing, conscious activity of the living God."

CHAPTER V.

Ver. 1. *ὄπισθεν.* So, correctly, Elz., and the more modern edd. The tolerably well authenticated reading *ἔξωθεν* (2, 3, 4, 6, al., Vulg., Ar., Copt., al., Andr., Areth.), which Beng. likewise regards as justified, is an interpretation. Conversely, Origen (in Lach.), with reference to the correct *ὄπισθεν*, has said, instead of *ἔσωθεν*: *ἔμπροσθεν* (Ezek. ii. 10). So also ℵ. — Ver. 2. Before *φωνῇ*, in the Elz. text, and according to A, ℵ, 2, 4, 6, 7, al., together with Beng., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.], *ἐν* is to be placed. — The *ἐστιν* after *τίς* (Elz.), which is absent in A, ℵ, 10, 12, Orig., al., and, in some witnesses, stands only after *ἄξιος*, is an interpolation, and to be deleted (Beng., Treg., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.], etc.). — Ver. 4. Instead of *πολλά* (Elz.), read *πολύ*, according to ℵ, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, al., Andr. (Beng., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]). — The addition *καὶ ἀναγνῶναι* after *ἀνοῖξαι* (Elz.) is, after decisive witnesses, rejected already by Beng., Griesb., etc. — Ver. 5. *ὁ ἐκ τ. φυλ.* So A, 2, 4, 6, al., Bengel, Griesb., the more recent. Incorrectly, Elz.: *ὁ ὤν.* Perhaps the art. also is to be deleted (ℵ). — The variation *ὁ ἀνοίγων* (B, 2, 4, 6, 8, al., Areth.) is improperly preferred (Matth., Tisch., 1859) to the reading *ἀνοῖξαι* (A, ℵ, al., Lach.), as it is manifestly a modification. — The *λῦσαι* before *τὰς ἑ. σφ.* (Elz.) is certainly false, notwithstanding ℵ. — Ver. 6. After *καὶ εἶδον*, the Elz. text has introduced (cf. vi. 5, 8, xiv. 1, 14) *καὶ ἰδού*, against A, ℵ, 2, 4, 6, al. The question, however, is whether, with Beng., Tisch., etc., to delete both words, or, with Lach. (according to A: *καὶ εἶδον, καὶ*; cf. vi. 12, v. 11, vi. 1, viii. 13), only the *ἰδού*. — *οἱ εἰσιν τὰ ἑπτὰ τοῦ θεοῦ πνεύματα τὰ ἀπεσταλμένα.* So Elz. The *οἱ* is here correctly (Beng., Lach., Tisch., 1859 [W. and H.]) according to ℵ, A; the *ἅ*, on the other hand (2, 3, 4, al., Areth., ed. Comp., Matth., Tisch., 1854), is, like the isolated *ἅτινα* (in Matth.), a correction. The *ἑπτὰ* before *πνεύματα τοῦ θεοῦ*, for this is the right order of words (A, ℵ, Beng., Matth., Lach., Tisch.), is wanting in A, 12, and may be an interpolation (cf. i. 4, iv. 5); but probably it is here (ℵ) just as, in iv. 5., Tisch. has it correctly in the text. Instead of *ἀπεσταλμένα* (ℵ, Beng., Tisch. IX.), before which the art. only is inserted, Lach. reads *ἀπεσταλμένοι* according to A, Matth.; Tisch.: *ἀποστελλόμενα* according to B and a considerable number of minusc. Yet the latter reading appears to be a modification, while the form *ἀπεσταλμένοι* is scarcely allowable in the language of the Apoc., and appears to be an error occasioned by the preceding *οἱ*. — Ver. 7. The interpretation *τὸ βιβλίον* after *εἴληφεν* (Elz., Beng.), also placed at the close of the verse (ed. Compl., al.), is lacking in A, ℵ, 2, 4, 6, al., Vulg. (Griesb., Matth., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]). — Ver. 8. Instead of *κιθάρας* (Elz.), read, according to A, ℵ, 2, 4, 6, al., Copt., al., *κιθάραν* (Beng., Matth., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]). — Vv. 9, 10. Elz.: *ἠγόρασας τῷ θεῷ ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ αἵματί σου ἐκ πασ. φυλ. — καὶ ἐποίησας ἡμᾶς τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν βασιλεῖς καὶ ἱερεῖς καὶ βασιλεύσομεν ἐπὶ της γῆς.* Incorrect here is: *First*, the *ἡμᾶς*, ver. 9 (ℵ), which is wanting in A, Areth. (rejected already by Mill, *Prol.*, 1111, Lach., Tisch.), which was inserted (cf. i. 6); and which Primas, Vulg., have *before* God (and that, too, that with him "they shall reign over them," ver. 10), because a more

accurate determination of the object is wished than is found in the words *ἐκ πασ. φυλ., κ.τ.λ.* *Secondly*, the *ἡμᾶς* (ver. 10), for which, according to A, ℵ, 2, 4, al., Syr., Vulg. (var. *nos*), Copt., Ar., Aeth., Andr., ed. Compl., etc., *αὐτοὺς* is to be written (Mill, l. c., Matth., Beng., Griesb., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]). Probably false is, *thirdly*, the *τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν* (ℵ) lacking in A (Tisch.; retained by Lach., Tisch. IX. [W. and H.]). Instead of the correction *βασιλεῖς*, read, according to A, ℵ, Vulg., al., *βασιλείαν* (Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]); cf. i. 6. Finally, read *βασιλεύσουσιν*, according to A, 7, 8, 9, al., Syr., ed. Compl. (Mill, l. c., Matth., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]). Because objection was made to the pres., *βασιλεύσουσιν* was written (ℵ, 2, 4, 5, 6, Cypr., Vulg., Beng., Griesb.), and then, corresponding to the introduced *ἡμᾶς*: *βασιλεύσομεν.* — Ver. 12. *Ἄξιον.* It is worthy of note, that A has *ἄξιος* (so ed. Erasm. I., Ald.), defended by Bengel in his *Gnomon*, and received by Tisch., 1859, IX. — Ver. 13. The *ἐστὶν* after *ὁ* (Elz., Beng.) is without authenticity; it belongs after *θαλάσσης*, and that, too, without the *ἃ* preceding in the rec. So according to A, 2, 4, 6, al., Verss.; already Matth.; also Tisch., 1854 [W. and H.], who, however, in 1859, has received the *ἃ* (B, al.). ℵ: *τὸ ἐν τ. οὐρ.* — *καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ θαλ. καὶ τὰ ἐν αυτ.* — Instead of the rec., *τὰ ἐν αὐτ. πάντα ἤκουσα λέγοντας*, Lach. has written, in accordance with A, *τὰ ἐν αὐτ. πάντα ἡκ. λέγοντα*; Matth., Beng., Tisch., in accordance with 2, 4, 7, al., *τὰ ἐν αὐτοις, πάντας ἡκ. λέγοντας.* In favor of the latter reading is its greater difficulty when compared with that of Cod. A. ℵ interprets: *κ. τὰ ἐν αὐτ. πάντα, καὶ ἤκ. λέγοντας.*

Amidst the songs of praise of the heavenly ones, the Lamb receives from the hand of God the book to be opened by him, in which stands written "what must come to pass" (cf. iv. 1).

Ver. 1. *ἐπὶ τὴν δεξιὰν* designates not that the book lies "on the right side of the Enthroned One," and therefore on the throne, as Ebrard thinks, who lays stress upon the fact as to how this peaceful, apparently useless, lying is consistent with its being closed; for this idea, which is of course in itself, and according to the wording, possible, is in conflict with ver. 7, as there the *ἐκ τῆς δεξιᾶς, κ.τ.λ.*, because of its express reference to the *ἐπὶ τὴν δεξιὰν*, ver. 1, does not well admit of the intermediate supposition that the Enthroned One has first taken the book into his right hand. But of course *ἐπὶ τὴν δεξ.* does not directly mean, "*in* the right hand,"[1] for which no appeal can be made to xvii. 8, xx. 1: on the contrary, the correct idea is derived especially from xx. 1, that the Enthroned One holds the book *on* his (open) hand, offering it, and likewise waiting whether any one will be found worthy to take and open it.[2] — The *βιβλίον* thus visible (*καὶ εἰδον*) according to its exterior, even to John, is to be regarded, undoubtedly, a מְגִלָּה, as in Ezek. ii. 9 sq., a book-roll,[3] which form alone is adapted to its present holy use. Like the book of Ezekiel, this was also an *ὀπισθόγραφον*,[4] viz., written not

[1] Vulg., N. de Lyra, Luther, Vitr.; cf. also Hengstenb.

[2] Beng. Cf. also De Wette.

[3] E. Huschke (*Das Buch mit sieben Siegeln in d. Off.*, Leipz. u. Dresd., 1860) understands a document folded together, and sealed outwardly in the Roman way by seven witnesses, concerning the O. and N. T. covenant of God with man. But this strange statement is elaborated in its details neither without great artificialness nor many exegetical errors. Ewald and others have declared themselves against it.

[4] Lucian, *Vit. Auction.* 9; Plin., L. III., ep. 5.

only ἔσωθεν, i.e., within, on the surface turned inwardly about the staff, but also ὄπισθεν,[1] i.e., on the side turned outwards in unrolling, the ordinarily unwritten side of the parchment. Thus the exceedingly rich contents of the book are indicated, *completely* comprising[2] the Divine decrees concerning the future (ἃ δεῖ γενέσθαι, iv. 1); while the sevenfold sealing[3] shows that these Divine decrees are a deep, hidden mystery, which can be beheld only by an ἀποκάλυψις whose mediator is only the Lamb, since it is his part to open the seals.[4] — The idea of the book in which the decrees of the Divine government appear written occurs already in Ps. cxxxix. 16; cf. also Exod. xxxii. 32; Rev. iii. 5, xx. 12. It is only by awkward conjectures that the opinion is obtained, that the βιβλίον is the O. T.[5] or the entire Holy Scriptures, — possibly the N. T. within, and the O. T. without.[6] Incorrect also is Wetstein: "*The book of divorce* from God, written against the Jewish nation, is represented," — a view contradicting every feature both of the more immediate and more remote context. Inapplicable also Schöttgen, with whom Hengstenb. agrees: "The book contains the sentence designed against the enemies of the Church." It is true that this passage, considered by itself, does not yet permit us to recognize the contents and meaning of the book in its details;[7] yet it must be explained here partially from the meaning of chs. iv. and v., partly from the organism of the entire Apocalypse from ch. vi., and partly from the meaning of viii. 1, that the book sealed with seven seals could have contained not only what is written from vi. 1 to viii. 1, called by Hengstenb. the group of seals,[8] because Hengstenb. incorrectly affirms that in the entire scene, chs. iv. and v., nothing else than judgments upon enemies is to be expected, as such are to be represented in the completely closed group of seals in viii. 1. Rather the appearance of the enthroned God, and the entire scene, chs. iv., v., afford the guaranty that not only enemies are judged, but also friends are blessed, just as both necessarily belong together. To this the consideration must be added, that, according to the clear plan of the Apoc. itself, the so-called group of seals is by no means closed with viii. 1,[9] nor even with xi. 19,[10] since from the seventh seal a further development proceeds to the end of the Apoc.,[11] so that the contents of the seventh seal are presented completely only at the end of the book; consequently the contents of this book comprised in seven seals, which is opened by the Lamb, appear to be repeated in the succeeding Apoc. from ch. vi. on,[12] as John himself[13] has proclaimed his entire prophetic writing as a revelation communicated to him through Christ. The plain speech, i. 1 and iv. 1, clearly makes known the essential significance in ch. v. — It has been found difficult to assign a place in the book-roll to the seven seals.

[1] *A tergo*, "on the back," Juv., *Sat.* I. 6. *In aversa charta*, "on the turned leaf," Mart. viii. 22.

[2] Cf. De Wette, Stern, etc.

[3] Cf. x. 4, xxii. 10; Isa. xxix. 11; Dan. xii. 4, 9.

[4] Cf. i. 1.

[5] Victorin.

[6] Primas, Beda, Zeger.

[7] Ebrard.

[8] Alcas. considers in the same sense the section chs. vi.-xi.

[9] Hengstenb.

[10] Alcas.

[11] Cf. Introduction, sec. 1.

[12] Cf. N. de Lyra, C. a Lap., Beng., De Wette, Klief., etc.

[13] i. 1.

Grot. (who altogether preposterously combines the καὶ ὄπισθεν with κατεσφραγ.), Vitr., Wolf,[1] were of the opinion that the entire book consisted of seven leaves, each with a seal; C. a Lap., De Wette, etc., thought that attached to the book as rolled up were a number of strings, and on them the seven seals were fastened, so that thus each seal could be opened seven times, and the part of the book that had been closed by the same could be read, but at the same time the seals outwardly attached to the volume were visible to John. But all these artificial hypotheses are unnecessary; and the most natural idea, that the seals fastened the end of the leaves rolled about the staff, and thus hindered the unrolling or opening of the book, is without difficulty, provided it be only considered that it does not belong at all to the opening of the seals that a part of the book be unrolled and read, but rather that — according to the incomparably more forcible and better view — the contents of the book come forth from the loosed seal portrayed in plastic symbols. The revelation concerning the future, described in the book of God, is given to the prophet, as he gazes, in significative images which represent the contents of the book; but there is no reading from the book to him. This mode of presentation, so completely harmonizing with the artistic energy of the writer of the Apoc., has been misunderstood especially by De Wette, as he attempts to explain the circumstance that none other than the Lamb, i.e., Christ, can open the book, by affirming that "with the opening of the book of fate, a sort of *fulfilment* is combined," viz., the preparatory carrying-out of the Divine decrees in heavenly outlines, as held by the rabbins.[2] The subject at the loosing of the seals, and the opening of the book, is nothing else than a revelation that is to be given John.[3]

Ver. 2 sqq. ἰσχυρὸν. The adjective[4] is by no means without meaning;[5] but does not, however, designate an angel of higher rank,[6] having reference to the κηρύσσ. ἐν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ, as x. 1, 3. The angel must have great power, because with his call he is to penetrate all regions of the creation.[7] — ἄξιος. As John i. 27, where, however, not the inf., but ἵνα, follows. Cf. also ἱκανός, Matt. viii. 8. The "worthiness" is the inner, ethical presupposition of the "being able," ver. 3. — ἀνοῖξαι τὸ βιβλίον καὶ λῦσαι τὰς σφραγ. αὐτ. A hysteron proteron.[8] — ὑποκάτω τῆς γῆς, ver. 3. Incorrectly, Grot.: "In the sea." It designates[9] the entire sphere of creation, according to its three great regions.[10] By ὑποκάτω τῆς γῆς is meant[11] Hades,[12] as the place, not of demons,[13] to think of which here is very strange, but of departed souls. — βλέπειν is not "by reading to understand,"[14] but designates the seeing, following the opening of the book, therefore the looking in, the reading, of the same.[15]

Ver. 4. καὶ ἐγὼ ἔκλαιον πολύ. This expressly emphasizes what John on his

[1] Cf. also Ew.

[2] Maimonid., *More Nevoch.*, ii. 6: "God does nothing until he has seen it in the family above," in Wetst. on iv. 1.

[3] Cf. also Hengstenb., Ebrard.

[4] Cf. Ps. ciii. 20.

[5] "A mere ornamental epithet," Eichh.

[6] C. a Lap., Züll., Stern; cf. also De Wette. N. de Lyra · Gabriel.

[7] Vitr., Beng., Hengstenb., Ebrard, Ew. ii.

[8] De Wette.

[9] Cf. ver. 13; Phil. ii. 10.

[10] Beng.

[11] Otherwise than Exod. xx. 4.

[12] Ebrard.

[13] Cf. Vitr.

[14] Bretschneider.

[15] Ew., De Wette, etc.

part (ἐγώ) did under the circumstances described in vv. 2, 3. His violent[1] weeping is caused simply by the fact that it seems as though the revelation ardently expected, and, according to iv. 1, to be hoped for, would not follow. "John did not observe any one advancing at the call of the angel, to render this office for the Church." So Vitr. correctly, who nevertheless, in violation of the context, precipitately interprets[2] it chiefly of purely personal interests of John, which in no way are here "represented by the church."[3] — Inapplicable is the remark of Hengstenb.: "The weeping of John has his weakness of faith as its foundation. Without it, he would not have wept at the impossibility for all creatures to loose the seals, but would, on the contrary, have triumphed in Christ. Without it, also, the book of the future, according to all which the prophets of the O. T. and the Lord had said, would not have been absolutely closed to him." John was satisfied, rather, in all humility of faith, even though weeping, that, according to what he had just heard, the book must remain closed to him.[4] The Lamb had not as yet entered to open the book. But the reference to the predictions of the O. T. prophets, and of the Lord himself, is inapposite; because, if the entire scene is not to be senseless, it treats of such revelations as had not as yet been made. The only objection against the weeping of John that could be raised from the context is, that after iv. 1 sqq., he need not at all have been anxious about being compelled to be without the revelation as to the contents of the sealed book; but even this objection can be raised only from the standpoint of a reflection which is here entirely out of place.[5]

Ver. 5. One of the elders[6] stills the weeping of John, by showing him Christ as the one able to open the book. — The deictic ἰδού intensifies the pictorial vividness of the description. Corresponding to the ἰδού is the καὶ εἶδον, κ.τ.λ., ver. 6; there John directs his look to the Lamb, to whom the elders had pointed him. — ἐνίκησεν. The explanation is divided into two parts. Grot.,[7] Vitr., C. a Lap., Beng., Eichh., Heinr., Ew., etc., regarded[8] the ἐνίκησεν in immediate combination with the ἀνοῖξαι, κ.τ.λ., so that the latter appears as an object to the conception ἐνίκησεν.[9] Others, as N. de Lyra, Calov., Boss., Ebrard, Klief.,[10] have, on the other hand, referred the ἐνίκησεν to the triumphantly completed work of redemption,[11] so that then

[1] πολύ, Luke vii. 47.

[2] Cf. N. de Lyra, Beng., Ebrard, etc.

[3] Hengstenb.

[4] Cf. Acts i. 7; Matt. xxiv. 36; Mark xiii. 32.

[5] Against Klief., who does not hesitate to ascribe to John a harassing doubt as to whether, because of the unworthiness of creatures, the Divine ultimate purpose, at least with respect to God's will of love, must remain unaccomplished.

[6] The attempt has been made also to determine who this elder is. Matthew is suggested, because in his Gospel (xxviii. 18) there is a declaration concerning the omnipotence of Christ. N. de Lyra prefers to understand Peter, who, however, had already met with a martyr's death.

[7] "He has obtained that which you thought must be despaired of."

[8] The older interpreters mostly, with a false parallel to זָכָה (Ps. li. 6; LXX., νικᾶν).

[9] "He has attained, prevailed in a struggle, to open," etc.

[10] Cf. also De Wette, Hengstenb.

[11] N. de Lyra. "Was victor in the resurrection." Calov.: "Conquered the infernal lion." Boss., Ebrard: "Victory over sin, death, and the Devil." So also Hengstenb., who, however, at the same time confusedly falls into the first mode of exposition: "Overcoming the difficulties which opposed the opening of the book."

the infinitive statement, *ἀνοῖξαι, κ.τ.λ.*, appears not in an objective relation to *ἐνίκησεν*, but as exegetical,[1] and the *ἐνίκησεν* as absolute. The latter conception is correct, because the former combination of the *ἐνίκησεν* with the inf. is not so much "a new and poetic mode,"[2] as is contradicted by the mode of statement in the Apoc.,[3] and because not only the correlation of the designations of the victor, *ὁ λέων, ὁ ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Ἰούδα, ἡ ῥίζα Δαυίδ*, but also the words, ver. 9, which may be regarded as an authentic interpretation of the mode of expression in ver. 5, are decisive for the second of the explanations previously mentioned. "The Lion of the tribe of Judah" is Christ,[4] because in his bodily descent from Judah, as the true Messiah promised of old, he had victoriously fought. [See Note XLV., p. 216.] In the same sense, the designation *ἡ ῥίζα Δαυίδ*[5] represents him as a sprout growing from the root of David with fresh, triumphant power. Thus N. de Lyra, C. a Lap., Grot., Eichh., Ew., De Wette, Hengstenb., Ebrard, etc., correctly explain, recognizing the slight metonymy; and Calov. and others, incorrectly, because against the decisive fundamental passage: "Christ, according to his divine nature, is represented as the foundation and source of David himself."[6] The Christian fundamental view is presented, which not only in the same words, but also in the same tense (*ἐνίκησα*, aor.), is expressed already in iii. 21, and is repeated immediately afterwards in ver. 9,[7] only in another statement or explanation; viz., that, just because Christ has struggled and conquered in earthly humility,[8] he is worthy to open the sealed book. It especially harmonizes with this view, that one of the elders, therefore one of those who have in themselves experienced the fruit of Christ's victory, and with complete clearness know the entire meaning of this victory, directs the weeping John to the Lion of the tribe of Judah; not as though this elder had observed that Christ meanwhile had besought the enthroned God for permission to open the book, and had obtained it,[9] but because the elder has the blessed assurance that the exalted Christ, since he is Lord and King of his kingdom, is also the Mediator of all revelation.

Ver. 6. *ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ θρονοῦ — καὶ ἐν μέσῳ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων.* Incorrectly, Ebrard: "The Lamb appears *in the midst of the throne*, so as at the same time to *sit* in the centre of the four living beings, and in the centre of the twenty-four elders sitting around without, forming a more remote concentric circle," — a truly monstrous idea, — the Lamb sitting[10] in the midst of the throne. The double *ἐν μέσῳ* designates, in the Heb. way,[11] the two limits between which the Lamb stands,[12] viz., in the space whose centre, the throne, is beside the four beings, and which is bounded externally by the circle[13] of the elders. Yet we must not necessarily understand that the Lamb stood on the crystal

[1] Cf. Winer, p. 298 sq.
[2] Ew.
[3] ii. 7, 11, 17, etc.; especially iii. 21.
[4] According to Gen. xlix. 9.
[5] From Isa. xi. 10. Cf. ver. 1.
[6] Cf. also Vitr., Herd.
[7] Cf. already ver. 6.
[8] Because as the slain Lamb he has wrought redemption, ver. 13. Cf. Phil. ii. 8 sq.; Isa. liii.
[9] As Ew. i. takes it, falling into an error contrary to both the word and sense of the text.
[10] *ἑστηκός*; which Alcas., just as correctly, translates by "lying."
[11] Cf. Lev. xxvii. 12, 14: בְּתוֹךְ-בֵּין. LXX.: *ἀναμέσον — καὶ ἀναμέσον.*
[12] Ew., De Wette, Hengstenb.
[13] Cf. iv. 4.

sea,[1] as De Wette does, who, in accordance with his explanation of iv. 6, finds a parallel in Heb. ix. 24. Of the sea of glass, and the position of the Lamb with regard to it, there is nothing at all to be said here; as for the rest, we may point to vii. 17, xxii. 1, as against De Wette. — *ἀρνίον ἑστηκὸς ὡς ἐσφαγμένον.* The diminutive form, which is in general peculiar to the Apoc.,[2] serves here to strengthen the contrast between the announced "Lion," and the form of "a little lamb" which is now presented. Entirely remote is the reference to the brief life of the Lord in comparison with the extreme age of the elders.[3] Incorrect also is the remark that *ἀρνίον*, from the masc. *ἀρήν*, is used with respect to the flock that is to follow;[4] for the diminutive, which is not at all from *ἀμνός*, is entirely without this exclusive designation of sex,[5] and the context itself (*ὡς ἐσφαγμ.*) bars the reference to the *leading* of a flock. — Great as in other respects is the contrast between the "Lion" and "the little Lamb," yet there is also a deep harmony of the two views; for as the struggles of the Lion presupposed in ver. 5, i.e., his patient suffering and death, concur with the slaying of the Lamb, so also the victory of the Lion gained in conflict, which becomes manifest in the resurrection, is appropriated by the little Lamb, since it "*stands* as one slain." The *ἑστηκός* clearly declares that it is living,[6] while it at the same time (*ὡς ἐσφαγμένον*) appears as one that had (previously) been led to the shambles and slain. The word *σφάζειν*, properly "to open the throat with a knife, so that the blood flows out," designates pre-eminently the slaying in making a sacrifice,[7] but also any other slaying,[8] and any form of putting to death.[9] By *ὡς* the *ἐσφαγμένον* is not "especially emphasized as significantly presented,"[10] as though equivalent to *ὡς* in passages like xvii. 12; Matt. vii. 29; John i. 14; Rom. xv. 15, where the reality of a relation in its normative or fundamental significance is marked, — for in this way, in the present passage, the absurd and actually false idea would result, that the Lamb stood as one slain, i.e., at that time dead; but the *ὡς*[11] serves rather to reconcile the opposition between the *ἑστηκός* and *ἐσφαγμένον*, as the Lamb standing (and therefore living) is represented as "one slain," i.e., as such an one whose still-visible scars show that it has once been slain.[12] John, therefore, applies to the Lamb the very same that the Lord, in i. 18, says of himself. There is in this view no violation whatever of the laws of the plastic art.[13] — The Lamb had a twofold emblem: *κέρατα ἑπτὰ*, the symbol of perfect power,[14] and *ὀφθαλμοὺς ἑπτά*, which is expressly interpreted *οἵ εἰσι τὰ πνεύματα τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπεσταλμένα εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν.* The refer-

[1] iv. 6.

[2] v. 8, 12, 13, vi. 1, 16, vii. 9, 14, xii. 11, xiii. 8, xvii. 14. Cf., on the other hand, John i. 29, 36; 1 Pet. i. 19; Acts viii. 32: *ὁ ἀμνός.* The expression *τὰ ἀρνία μου*, John xxi. 5, whereby Christ designates his believers — cf. Meyer on the passage — does not belong here, because used here in an especial way, upon the basis of Isa. liii. 7, to designate Christ himself. Against Hengstenb.

[3] Against Bengel and Hengstenb.

[4] Beng.

[5] Cf. cxiv. 4, 6; Jer. xi. 19; John xxi. 15.

[6] Grot., etc.

[7] Cf. Exod. xii. 6.

[8] Isa. liii. 7.

[9] Rev. xiii. 3, 8; 1 John iii. 12; cf. my commentary on the latter passage.

[10] Ebrard.

[11] N. de Lyra refers the "*tanquam* occisum" to the daily bloodless sacrifice in the mass.

[12] Cf. xiii. 3. Andr., C. a Lap., Grot., Vitr., Beng., Herd., Ew., De Wette, Stern, Hengstenb.

[13] De Wette.

[14] Cf. xvii. 3 sqq.; Ps. cxii. 9, cxlviii. 14; 1 Sam. ii. 10; Dan. vii. 20 sqq., viii. 3 sqq.

ence of the spirits of God, symbolized by the seven eyes,[1] to the omniscience of the Lord,[2] is too limited. The correct interpretation is determined by the context itself (ἀπεσταλμένα). The (seven) spirits of God are also, here,[3] the potencies which in their independent reality are present with God, and by means of which he works on and in the world. That Christ *has*[4] these spirits (this Spirit) of God, is symbolized here by the seven eyes of the Lamb, just as before the throne of God (the Father) the same Spirit appears as seven lamps.[5] This, moreover, in no way compels the conception, that the vision has changed after the manner of a dream, and now where the seven eyes of the Lamb are represented, the seven lamps have vanished,[6] as indeed the belonging of the Spirit to the Enthroned One, as also to the Lamb, is intended to be symbolically represented. — Erroneous is the explanation of Beda: "The septiform spirit in Christ is because of the eminence of its power compared to horns, and because of the illumination of grace to eyes."[7] But if even grammatically it is not impossible for the οἵ, which introduces the explanatory sentence, to refer to ὀφθαλμούς *and* κέρατα, the annexed interpretation, οἱ εἰσι τὰ πνεύμ., κ.τ.λ., applies only to the ὀφθαλμούς, and not at the same time to the κέρατα. It would, of course, be in itself inconceivable,[8] if one and the same thing were represented by two symbols, perhaps in two different connections: but here are two symbols, which throughout do not designate the same thing; for while by the "horns," a symbol known already from the O. T., and therefore applied by John without any particular hint, the attribute of power is symbolized, the eyes, according to the express interpretation of the text, designate in no way an attribute of the Lamb, but the Spirit really present with God and the Lamb together (the Father and the Son), and belonging in like manner to them both, who is here indeed to be regarded according to the standard of the symbol (ὀφθαλμ.) pre-eminently as the One seeing through all things.[9] Because Christ has the Spirit, he knows every thing, even things upon earth, whither the Spirit is sent, — the doings of his enemies, the state of his own people, etc.

Ver. 7. Καὶ ἦλθε καὶ εἴληφε. The perf. has,[10] as also elsewhere among those later,[11] the sense of the aor., — which is the easier here because an aor. precedes. — The Lamb "took" it (the book) out of the hand of God offering it.[12] Ebrard wishes to translate it "*received*," because "the active taking does not suit the Son's position with respect to the Father." But while of course it is self-evident that no one, not even the Lamb, can take the book if God do not give it, yet the idea of the active taking on the part of the Lamb lies more in the course of the entire connection, as it presents the glory of the Lamb eminent above all creatures, and not the possible subordi-

[1] Cf. i. 4, iii. 1, iv. 5.

[2] Cf., especially, Vitr., who refers the power to the opening, and the knowledge to the reading and understanding, of the book.

[3] Cf. i. 4, iv. 5.

[4] iii. 1.

[5] iv. 5.

[6] Ebrard.

[7] So also Beng., De Wette, etc.; only that these expositors, with less error, regarded the eyes as a symbol of knowledge.

[8] Against Ebrard.

[9] Cf. 1 Cor. ii. 10.

[10] Cf. viii. 5.

[11] Winer, p. 255.

[12] Cf. ver. 1.

nation of the same to God. The Lamb can take the book for the reason indicated already in ver. 5,[1] but in no way because of having meanwhile received from God permission which had been previously asked.[2] To consider with Vitr. as to whether the Lamb also had hands, etc., is unnecessary and without point.

Ver. 8. ὅτε ἔλαβεν ("*when he had taken it*")."[3] The aor. is to be understood just as in vi. 1, 3, etc.[4] Simultaneousness[5] would have been expressed by the impf.[6] Naturally, upon the act of the Lamb, which displays the glory belonging exclusively to him, there follows the song of praise, in which the glory just evinced is celebrated. — As in ch. iv., the four beings, the representatives of the entire living creation, and the twenty-four elders, the representatives of redeemed humanity, have worshipped the enthroned God in alternate songs of praise, so here there sounds their united song of praise to the Lamb, before whom they together fall down in adoration; for the Lamb shares in the divine glory of the Enthroned One.[7] This song of praise finds a response first in ver. 12, in the angelic hosts, and then, in ver. 13, is taken up by all creatures everywhere, and that, too, so that at the close a doxology, in a manner concentrated, sounds forth at the same time to the One sitting on the throne and to the Lamb, and finally dies away in the amens of the four beings who had begun the praise of the enthroned God (iv. 8); and, at the same time with the twenty-four elders, that of the Lamb (v. 9). — ἔχοντες ἕκαστος — ἁγίων belongs only to οἱ πρεσβύτ.: for this is indicated, *first*, by the masc. form (ἔχοντες ἕκαστος); *secondly*, the unnaturalness of ascribing to beings as fashioned in iv. 7, harps and vials; and *thirdly*, the incongruence which would result if the representatives of the *creation* had the office of offering the prayers of saints. The latter is suitable only to elders.[8] — The elders have each a harp, the instrument with which they accompany their song of praise,[9] and "golden vials full of frankincense," viz., as is self-evident, each one a vial, so that we possibly are to think of a vial in the right hand, while the left holds the harp.[10] The vials filled with frankincense have a symbolical meaning corresponding to the emblem of the harp: αἱ εἰσιν αἱ προσευχαὶ τῶν ἁγίων. The αἱ may, by attraction, be referred to the θυμιαμάτων,[11] yet the formally more simple reference to φιάλας may be adopted, as the vials are just such as are filled with incense. Concerning the symbolical meaning "its," cf. viii. 3; Ps. cxli. 2; Ezek. viii. 11. Arbitrarily and against the meaning of the context, Hengstenb. understands by the prayers symbolically offered only intercessory prayers, whose chief subject is the protection and perfection of the Church, and judgment upon enemies; while he regards the harps as referring to prayers of adoration and thanksgiving.[12] — τῶν ἁγίων, i.e., of Christians.[13] Cf. viii. 3, 4, xiii. 7, 10, xi. 18, xviii. 20. The misunderstanding of this as referring to saints already in heaven[14] is inap-

[1] Cf. ver. 9.
[2] Ew. i.
[3] De Wette.
[4] Cf. Matt. vii. 28, ix. 25.
[5] "*Als er nahm*," Luth.
[6] 1 Cor. xiii. 11.
[7] Cf. ver. 13, xxii. 1.
[8] In other respects the λέγοντες, ver. 9, has a different relation.
[9] Cf. xiv. 2 sqq., xv. 2; Ps. cxlvi. 7, cl. 3.
[10] Vitr., Ebrard. [11] Vitr.
[12] Cf. De Wette, Ebrard, etc.
[13] De Wette, Ew. ii.
[14] Hengstenb.; cf. Beng.

plicable for the reason that the idea that the prayers of the saints are offered to God by the elders[1] presupposes the fact that the saints themselves are not present with God. With this agrees the mode in which the elders, ver. 9, speak of the saints. — The remark of C. a Lap.: "Note here against Vigilantius, Luther, Calvin, and other Hagiomachoi, that the saints pray for us, and offer our prayers to God," is, in other respects, entirely wrong: because, *first*, the "elders" are in no way identical with the saints who are meant; *secondly*, while, on the Lutheran side, it is not at all denied that the members of the Church triumphant pray for those of the Church militant [see Note XLVI., p. 217], there is no allusion whatever to the invocation of saints contended against on the Lutheran side; and, *finally*, it is entirely incorrect to regard the forms of the twenty-four elders included in the plan as real personages, and without any thing further to construct a dogmatical statement upon the act symbolically ascribed to them. Erroneous also is De Wette's conjecture that John appears to know nothing of a mediatorial office of Christ. Of this, nothing can be expressly said in the present passage, although of course the entire Christology of the Apoc. essentially includes that fundamental Christian thought.

Ver. 9. καὶ ᾄδουσιν, viz., they who have fallen down; i.e., the four beings and the twenty-four elders.[2] Hengstenb. arbitrarily understands this: "That the elders come forward as the speakers of the chorus formed of them and the four beasts." — ᾠδὴν καινήν. Cf. xiv. 3. Too indefinitely, N. de Lyra: "pertaining to the N. T.;" yet he has also the correct feeling that the *new* song refers to a new subject. Here this is not completed redemption,[3] but as the succeeding song itself shows, and the express connection determines, the worthiness[4] of the Lamb to open the book,[5] acquired through the painful work[6] of redemption. [See Note XLVII., p. 217.] λέγοντες introduces the song announced (ᾄδουσ. ᾠδ. καιν.). Cf. iv. 1, 8. — ὅτι ἐσφάγης. The Lamb himself is represented ὡς ἐσφαγμένον.[7] In the entire statement presenting the ground (ὅτι ἐσφ.) for the ἄξιος εἶ, κ.τ.λ., the aorists ἐσφάγης, ἠγόρασας, ἐποίησας, are to be strictly observed: they refer to the definite fact that has once occurred, of the crucifying of the Lord (ἐσφάγης), and this one fact[8] is described according to its effect: ἠγόρασας, κ.τ.λ., and ἐποίησας. Incorrectly, Beng.: "*And hast purchased us* to be thy possession. This refers not to the redemption itself, which occurred when the Lamb was slaughtered and his blood was sprinkled, but to its fruit, and refers, therefore, to those saints who have finished their course, and who have been bought from the earth, xiv. 3." Bengel's error is occasioned by the false reading ἡμᾶς.[9] — Incorrectly, Ewald: "By his bloody death he redeemed them to God, delivering to them the *doctrine*, following which they could emerge from the servitude of vices." How

[1] Cf. Tob. xii. 2.

[2] De Wette, etc.

[3] C. a Lap., Beng., etc.

[4] In violation of the context, Kliefoth: The reception and sealing of the book have to do with "the actual final accomplishment of the divine purpose." The subject here has to do with the opening of the book only in order that the revelation of the mysteries therein contained may be communicated to the seer.

[5] Cf. Vitr., who, at the same time, thinks of the new kind of song; Stern, Ebrard, Hengstenb.

[6] Cf. also ver. 5.

[7] Cf. Ew.

[8] Cf. i. 5 sqq.

[9] See Critical Notes.

completely the *ἠγόρασας* concurs with the *ἐσφάγης*, is evident especially from the fact that the blood of the slain Lamb is designated as the price of the purchase.[1] On the subject itself, cf. 1 Cor. vi. 20; 1 Pet. i. 18 sqq.; Acts xx. 28. — *ἐκ πάσης φυλῆς καὶ γλώσσης καὶ λαοῦ καὶ ἔθνους.* Object with the partitive *ἐκ*. Cf. 1 John iv. 13; Matt. xxv. 8 (Acts ii. 17). In the connection of the four expressions, the progress from less to greater[2] is of no significance, because unintentional; but what is of importance, and recurs uniformly in all similar passages, even though another expression[2] be chosen, is the number four, which serves to mark[3] the idea of universality.[3] Every more definite reference, however, which is given any one of the four expressions,[4] is consistent neither with the *πάσης*, nor with the intention of the entire manner of expression. — *καὶ ἐποίησας αὐτοὺς βασιλείαν καὶ ἱερεῖς καὶ βασιλεύουσιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.* This passage is distinguished from what is said in i. 6, *first*, by the *καὶ* before *ἱερεῖς*, and immediately afterwards by the important addition *καὶ βασιλεύουσιν, κ.τ.λ.* The latter would be superfluous, if either the reading received by Hengstenb., etc., were correct,[5] or the *βασιλείαν* could have had the meaning stated by Hengstenb. on i. 6, i.e., "a people invested with regal authority." Three things are here expressed: *first*, that those purchased to be God's property have been made into a *βασιλεία*, viz., of God, — i.e., they are gathered as God's property into God's kingdom; immediately afterwards (*καὶ*) that they are made priests; finally (*καὶ*), they themselves have been invested with regal authority. So Ebrard, correctly.[6] The last, expressed in an independent member of the sentence, and so far distinguished from the two predicates *βασιλείαν* and *ἱερεῖς*, has its justification in the meaning of i. 9; and it is a perversion to change the present *βασιλεύουσιν* into a future,[7] or to take it in the sense of a future. It is especially appropriate that the heavenly beings into whose mouths the song of praise, vv. 9, 10, is placed, should recognize in the contending and persecuting church the kings of the earth.

Vv. 11, 12. *Καὶ εἶδον.* Without foundation, Ebrard: "John sees something new, viz., he hears," according to the arbitrary conception that *εἶδον* designates, "in the weakened wide sense, visionary observation in general." Correctly, Beng., De Wette, etc.: "John sees the hosts of angels whose voice he hears." Cf. vi. 1 sqq. — Around the throne of God, and the four beings, and the twenty-four elders, the attention of the seer is completely occupied; he sees now the heavenly host,[8] an innumerable multitude: *καὶ ἦν ὁ ἀριθμὸς αὐτῶν μυριάδες μυριάδων καὶ χιλιάδες χιλιάδων.* The statement of numbers is still fuller than in Dan. vii. 10,[9] and indicates by its indefiniteness — for it is not said how many are the myriads of myriads — actual innumerability. Incorrectly, Bengel: "A less number added to the greater forbids both to be taken too indefinitely." The anti-climax[10] has the meaning that even the preceding very great number is still insufficient, but not that "with the im-

[1] *ἐν τ. αἱμ. σ.* Cf. Winer, p. 365.
[2] vii. 9, xi. 9, xiii. 7, xiv. 6; cf. x. 11, xvii. 15.
[3] Beng., Hengstenb.
[4] Beng. refers the *φυλῆς*, Züll. the *λαοῦ*, to the Jews.
[5] See Critical Notes.
[6] Cf. Beng.
[7] See Critical Notes.
[8] 1 Kings xii. 14.
[9] *χίλιαι χιλιάδες — καὶ μύριαι μυριάδες.*
[10] Cf. also Ps. lxviii. 18.

mense number the distinction vanishes."[1] — λέγοντες, cf. iv. 1, 8. — φωνῇ μεγάλῃ, cf. i. 10. — λαβεῖν, in adoring acknowledgment.[2] — τὴν δύναμιν. The article notes the power as peculiar to the Lamb; this, as also the δόξαν and τιμὴν, is shared with the enthroned God.[3] The force of the art., placed at the beginning, which in iv. 11 and vii. 12 is expressly repeated before each particular conception, affects the entire connection. Beng., excellently: "These seven words of praise must be expressed as though they were a single word, because they all stand with one another after a single article."[4] — πλοῦτον. Mentioned also in 1 Chron. xxix. 11, 12;[5] is not to be limited to the possession and distribution of *spiritual* goods,[6] but is in every respect unconditioned wealth in all blessings,[7] as it belongs to the all-sufficient God, and likewise to the Lamb who shares all his glory, and, therefore, also his throne.[8] — εὐλογία, not "blessing,"[9] but praise, honor. The seven items of the ascription of praise have, in other respects, nothing whatever to do with the seven seals,[10] but are accumulated in this number,[11] in order to express their holy completeness.

Ver. 13. As John wishes to state how finally "every creature (πᾶν κτίσμα) unites in the hymns of praise which have thus far been heard, — and that, too, so that now praise and honor are proclaimed alike to the enthroned God and the Lamb, and consequently, the hymns of praise from the two chs. iv. and v. are united in an overpowering harmony,[12] — he expressly mentions the four great "regions of the creation,"[13] the whole of which he wishes to represent, just as in Ps. cxlvi. 6, Phil. ii. 11, the entire creation is described in its three chief departments. Grot., etc., incorrectly: ἐπὶ τ. θαλάσσης is synonymous with ὑποκάτω τῆς γῆς. Entirely distorted is also the forced interpretation of Alcasar, according to which ἐν τ. οὐρ. is to be regarded as referring to Christians, ἐπὶ τ. γῆς to Jews, ἐπὶ τ. θαλ. to heathen, and ὑποκ. τ. γ. the damned and devils. Similar interpretations are to be found on Phil. ii. 10.[14] Yet the question as to what is meant by the πᾶν κτίσμα ὃ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ dare not be repulsed by the remark, which in itself is correct, that only one "exhaustive enumeration" is intended.[15] "*In* heaven," we cannot seek sun, moon, and stars,[16] but only the living heavenly beings to whom the godly glorified ones belong. "*On* the earth" is first collective humanity, yet all other creatures are connected therewith in thought. "*Under* the earth" are not demons, "who *unwillingly* obey Christ,"[17] the devils, who by "their very existence, and the gifts wherewith they are furnished, are a striking proof of the greatness and love of the Lamb also, because all things have been created by the *Son*,[18] — this is a reference alien to the connection in general, and entirely so to the designation τὸ ἀρνίον, — but those contained in Hades,[19] yet not in purga-

[1] Hengstenb.
[2] iv. 11. Ew., De Wette, Ebrard, etc.
[3] iv. 11.
[4] Cf. also Hengstenb.
[5] Cf. Eph. iii. 8; John i. 16.
[6] De Wette, Hengstenb., who refers to vv. 9, 10.
[7] Cf. Acts xvii. 25; Jas. i. 17.
[8] Cf. Vitr., Ew.
[9] Beng.
[10] Against Beng.
[11] As also vii. 12.
[12] Cf. Boss., Hengstenb., Ebrard, etc.
[13] Beng.
[14] See Meyer *in loc.*
[15] Ebrard.
[16] C. a Lap.
[17] Vitr.
[18] John i. 3, 10; Hengstenb.
[19] Cf. Phil. ii. 10.

tory.[1] By *ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης*, i.e., "*on* the sea" — not "in the sea,"[2] for the change of prepositions is to be accurately noticed — refers not to ships, but to such creatures as belong to the sea itself, here represented as situated not in the same,[3] but on the surface.[4] — *καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς*. On the *καὶ*, introducing an idea whereby several preceding special points are definitively comprised, cf. Matt. xxvi. 59; Mark xv. 1.[5] — *ἐν αὐτοῖς*, viz., in the spheres mentioned. Incorrectly, Grot.: "The things which are most deeply seated in animals and things, and escape the eyes of men." — *πάντας ἤκουσα λέγοντας*. If this reading is more correct than the, of course easier, *καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς πάντα ἤκ. λέγοντα*,[6] the masc. form is explained not by the arbitrary conception[7] that the ascription of praise proceeds not so much from creatures in the different regions of the creation (*πᾶν κτίσμα, κ.τ.λ.*) as rather from angels who, as chiefs, represent these regions; but the express form[8] corresponds to the prosopopoeia,[9] which here is still bolder than, e.g., Ps. ciii. 22, cxlviii. 1 sqq., xix. 1 sqq., because here John in his vision actually hears the song of praise raised by all the works of God. — The *four* points of the ascription of praise correspond with the simple classification of the entire creation;[10] but it is arbitrary to limit the *εὐλογία* to the *κτίσμα ὃ ἐν τ. οὐρανῷ*, etc.[11]

Ver. 14. The Amen, the formal confirmation and conclusion of the hymn of praise,[12] is uttered by the four beings, not because they occupy in any respect "a lower position,"[13] but because the whole tenor of the hymn of praise in chs. iv. and v., after resounding in ver. 13 to the farthest extent, returns to the point whence it started,[14] and thus comes to a truly beautiful rest.[15] But after the Amen has been uttered, nothing else remains for the elders than silent adoration, which, naturally,[16] is directed also to the Lamb, and not alone to the One sitting on the throne.[17]

Notes by the American Editor.

XLV. Ver. 5. *ὁ λέων ὁ ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Ἰούδα, κ.τ.λ.*

The expression is based upon Gen. xlix. 9. On the basis of Jacob's prophecy, a young lion was emblazoned on the standard of Judah, as it led the van of Israel's march through the desert. See *Palestinian Targum* on Num. ii. 2: "They who encamp eastward shall be of the standard of the camp of Judah, spreading over four miles. And his standard shall be of silk, of three colors, corresponding with the precious stones which are in the breastplate, — sardius, topaz, and carbuncle; and upon it shall be expressed and set forth the names of

[1] C. a Lap.
[2] Luther, etc.
[3] Cf. the *τὰ ἐν αὐτ.*
[4] Cf. De Wette.
[5] Winer, p. 407.
[6] See Critical Notes.
[7] Ewald.
[8] Cf. iv. 8.
[9] Cf. De Wette.
[10] Beng.
[11] Against Beng.
[12] Ewald. Cf. Deut. xxvii. 15 sqq.; Neh. v. 13; Ps. xli. 14; 1 Cor. xiv. 16.
[13] Hengstenb.
[14] Cf. iv. 8 sqq.
[15] Cf. Beng., Ebrard.
[16] Cf. v. 13.
[17] As Ew. i. thought, supported by the completely untenable *Recepta: προσκυν. ζῶντι εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων*, and corresponding to the view imposed upon John, that the Messiah also is a creation ("with adoration they honored *God* — as from him as author all things have proceeded, and the Messiah was created," iv. 2 sqq.)

the three tribes of Judah, Issachar, and Zebulun; and in the midst shall be written, 'Arise, O Lord, and let thine enemies be scattered, and thine adversaries be driven away before thee;' and *upon it shall be set forth the figure of a young lion.*" Augustine, *Serm.* xlvi., quoted by Calov.: "As a Lamb in his passion, so a Lion in his resurrection; since by this he manifested his fortitude in conquering death, and crushing the head of the infernal serpent (Gen. iii. 15; Hos. xiii. 14; Rom. i. 4)." Cf. Heb. ii. 14. Calov. finds the lion-like character of Christ displayed also in the call of the Gentiles. The *ἡ ῥίζα Δαυείδ* is analogous with *ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυείδ* in Rom. i. 3, it being, as Hengstenberg remarks, "in David that the lion nature of the tribe came into manifestation." In Christ, the race of the hero and victor David, whose deeds of courage are celebrated in Ps. xviii. 29 sqq., again comes forth. Calov.'s interpretation, referred to by Düst., which is that also of Ribera and Cocceius, rests upon the assumption that a double designation of the humanity of Christ, in both the Lion of Judah and the Root of David, is improbable; and that, in Rev. xxii. 16, there is a similar distinction between "root" and "offspring." Lange is right when he says, "The whole designation of Christ is a profound Christological saying, which refers neither alone to the human descent of the Saviour (Düsterdieck), nor to his divine nature simply (Calov.)." The divinely human person is designated by terms derived, indeed, from his humanity; but, because of the personal union and the inseparable participation of both natures in every act, comprehending our Lord also in his divinity."

XLVI. Ver. 8. *αἱ προσευχαὶ τῶν ἁγίων.*

See *Apology of the Augsburg Confession* (*E. T.*, p. 236): "We concede, that just as when alive they pray, in general, for the Church universal, so in heaven they pray for the Church in general." This is sufficient without resorting to the expedient that representatives of the Church triumphant are not here thought of. Quenstedt (*Theol. Didact.-pol.*, iv. 365): "That the saints in heaven triumphing with Christ pray, in general, for the Church, is probably inferred from this passage. But, from this, it cannot be inferred that they have a special knowledge of all things, and are to be religiously invoked. By odors, are not meant prayers of saints who are in this life, but of those blessed ones who are reigning with Christ in heaven. These prayers are not *ἱλαστικαί*, propitiatory, meritorious, and satisfactory, as though, by virtue of their merit, they intercede by them for others, but *εὐχαριστικαί* as described (vv. 9, 10)."

XLVII. Ver. 9. *ᾠδὴν καινήν.*

The adjective is *καινός*, *new in kind*, not *νεός*, *recent*. Luthard: "In distinction from the song of creation (ch. iv.), the new song of redemption." Bengel: "The word *new* is a thoroughly Apocalyptic word, — new name, new song, new heavens, new earth, new Jerusalem, — every thing new." Calov.: "It is new because the singers are new, viz., the renewed in heaven; and the theme is new, viz., the incarnation, passion, and redemption of Christ."

CHAPTER VI.[1]

Ver. 1. *φωνῆ.* So already Beng., Griesb., Matth., after decisive testimonies. The poor variations *φωνῆς* (Elz.), *φωνῶν, φωνήν* (א), are modifications. — After *ἔρχου*, neither *βλέπε* (Elz.) nor *ἴδε* (א, Beng.) is to be read. So according to A, C, 10, 17, al., ed. Compl., Genev., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]. Also, in vv. 3, 5, 8, the insertion is to be deleted. — Ver 2. *καὶ εἶδον* is improperly omitted in most minusc. as superfluous. — Ver. 4. *αὐτῷ* before *λαβεῖν* (Elz., Griesb., Tisch.), omitted in A as superfluous, has sufficient testimony in C, א, Vulg.; Lach. [W. and H.] has inserted it in brackets. — Instead of the unattested *ἀπὸ τ. γ.* (Elz.), read *ἐκ τ. γ.* (C, א, 2, 4, 6, al., Vulg., Syr., Andr., Lach., Tisch.). Nevertheless, even the mere *τῆς γῆς* is a reading to be held in high esteem, in favor of which is the testimony of A, and which may have been the *mater lectionis.* — *σφάξουσιν.* Elz., *σφάξωσι* (א). But A, C, justify here the reading of the fut. (Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]; cf. Winer, p. 271). — Ver. 6. In the Elz. text, in accord with A, C, א, 6, 12, 17, Vulg., *ὡς* is to be inserted (Lach.), which was omitted even by Tisch., 1873, because it was inconvenient. — Ver. 7. It is not improbable, that with Lach., Tisch. IX. [W. and H.], in accord with A, א, Vulg. the reading is: *φωνὴν τ. τετ. ζ. λεγοντος* (incorrectly, Elz., *λεγουσαν*), as the reading preferred by Tisch., etc., *τοῦ τετ. ζ. λέγοντος* (4, 6, 7, 8, al., Syr., Copt., Aral.; cf. C: *τὸ τέταρτον ζῶον λέγοντος*), may be an adaptation to the mode of speech (vv. 3, 5). — Ver. 8. Instead of *ἀκολουθεῖ* (A, Elz., Beng., Tisch.), the reading is probably *ἠκολούθει* (B, C, א, 2, 4, 6, al., Vulg., al., Griesb., Matth., Lach., Tisch. IX. [W. and H.]). — For *μετ' αὐτοῦ*, א has the easier *αὐτῷ.* — *ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς.* So, correctly, Elz., Lach., Tisch., 1859 [W. and H.], after A, C, א. The reading *αὐτῳ* (2, 4, 6, al., Vulg., Syr., al., Griesb., Beng., Matth., Tisch., 1854) arises from vv. 2, 4. — Ver. 10. *ἔκραξαν.* So A, C, א, 2, 4, 6, al., Beng., Griesb., Matth., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]. Without authenticity, Elz.: *ἔκραζόν.* — *ἐκ τῶν κατοίκ.* So, according to decisive witnesses, Matth. already. Incorrectly, Elz. (cf. Beng., Griesb.): *ὑπὸ.* — Ver. 11. The *μικρόν* after *χρόνον* (Elz., Lach., Tisch. IX. [W. and H.]) is very strongly attested by A, C, א, Vulg. It is lacking, it is true, in B, 2, 4, 6, al., Aeth., Ar., Compl., and is rejected by Beng., Griesb., Matth., Tisch.; but any transfer from xx. 3 is highly improbable, although it could readily have been omitted, because it seems difficult to make the further determination *ἕως πληρ., κ.τ.λ.*, accord with the brevity of the appointed time. — *πληρωθῶσιν.* So Beng., Treg., Lach., according with A, C, Vulg, al., Compl. Emendations are: *πληρώσονται* (Elz.), *πληρώσωσιν* (א, 2, 3, 4, 8, al., Matth., Tisch.), *πληρώσουσιν* (28). Ver. 15. The *πᾶς* before *ἐλευθ.* (Elz.) is, in accord with decisive witnesses, erased already by Beng.

[1] Cf. *De Apocalypsi Joannea ex rebus vatis aetate gestis explicanda disseruit.* Ed. Böhmer. Fasc. 1, Hal. Sax., 1854.

The seals of the book of fate were opened by the Lamb (cf. v. 1 sq.). Ch. vi. describes the opening of the first six of the seven seals, and reports the contents of the book thus unsealed. With vi. 17, the contents of the sixth seal are exhausted. Against Vitr., who finds in ch. vii. the second vision that is thought to proceed from the sixth seal, it may be noted already here, that the opening of each seal always brings with it only one vision.[1] Concerning the seventh seal, cf. viii. 1 sqq. — The seals are to be regarded not as belonging to the transitions of the book, but to the book itself; what is manifested at their opening serves, therefore, not as a significant type of what is contained only in the book itself, but by the opening of the seals the contents of the book are revealed.[2] The visions presented after the opening of the seals, also, are not, as Heinr. thinks, figures portrayed in the transitions of the book, — which is in no way conceivable in the first four, to say nothing of the last three seals; but they are significative images and events, which, proceeding from the unsealed book itself, signify future things[2] to the gazing prophet.[3] Ew. says, incorrectly, that the horsemen (vv. 2, 3, 5, 8) "proceed from a narrow place." They go forth from the unsealed book itself. — As the seven epistles, by a plain change in the form of composition,[4] were classified into three and four, so the seven seals — apart from the fact that, by ch. vii., the seventh seal (viii. 1 sqq.) is separated from the first six — fall into four (vi. 1-8) and three (vi. 9 sqq.). But Bengel's decision is arbitrary; viz., that the former class of four seals refer to what is visible, and the latter of three to what is invisible.[5] Still more arbitrarily, Alcasar thought that the first four seals represented "the conversion and happiness of the Jews who would believe in Christ;"[6] but the last three, "the unhappiness and punishment of Jews rebelling against Christ." In the first four seals, appear allegorical figures, horsemen on horses: in the last three, there are certain occurrences not portrayed in an allegorical way. Besides, the first four seals are placed in a certain relation to the four beings which surround God's throne (iv. 6 sq.); while every time, when a seal is opened, one of the four beings says to John, ἔρχου. But this must not be carried into minute details. Thus Beng. places in the east what is indicated in the first seal, as the first beast has his place to the east of God's throne, etc.; while Grot. finds it very suitable for his conception of the four beings, that, e.g., in the third seal, which treats of famine, and that, too, of that which occurred at the time of the Emperor Claudius, the third being, viz., Paul, speaks, for Agabus had prophesied to him of this famine.[7] But it would have been more consistent for Grot. to have regarded Agabus the third being. To the fourth seal, which threatens sicknesses, Grot. says, that the fourth being suits, viz., James, who, in his epistle, speaks of sicknesses. —

[1] Against Heinrichs, who thinks that only in ch. viii. the book itself is looked into, after the seven sealed "coverings" have been removed.

[2] ἃ δεῖ γενέσθαι μετὰ ταῦτα; cf. iv. 1.

[3] Cf. v. 1.

[4] See on ch. ii.

[5] "The blessed dead, especially the martyrs, the unblessed dead, and the holy angels with their service."

[6] The four horsemen are, "Faith, Courage, Want, Death, viz., as victor over the inordinate affections of still unbelieving men."

[7] Acts xi. 27 sqq.

Other expositors,[1] because of the signs of victory of the first seal compared with the victorious leonine strength and courage of the first lion-like being, and because of the persecutions of Christians, have mentioned thereon that the second being is like an ox, i.e , an animal for sacrifice, and more of such arbitrary interpretations. In accord with the allegorical meaning of the four beings who represent the living creation, especially the earthly, out of which their significant forms are fashioned,[2] and in accord with that which is reported concerning the visions themselves,[3] is the relation between the four beings and the first four visions of the seals, which in the constant *ἔρχου* of the individual beings, and in the voice (ver. 6) sounding in the midst of the four beasts, stamps the fact that visions are revealed which pertain to the earthly world, and that, too, to the whole of it.[4]

Ver. 1. *Καὶ εἶδον ὅτε, κ.τ.λ.*, does not mean, "*I was a spectator when* the Lamb opened a seal:"[5] the opening of the seal is *not* designated as the object of the *εἶδον*.[6] De Wette[7] and Ebrard attach such a wide significance to the *εἶδον*, that it may include the hearing mentioned directly afterwards; the meaning is that the prophetic "beholding" properly consisted in "hearing." It is more correct to say that what John *sees* when the seal is opened, he describes first in ver. 2, where the repeated *καὶ εἶδον* refers back to ver. 1. As in the vision itself, so also in its description, something heard is yet interposed. — *μίαν*. The cardinal number does not stand here for the ordinal,[8] but here, as directly afterwards in the *ἑνὸς ἐκ τ. τ. ζ.*, it is only *expressed* that one of the seals (beasts) is spoken of. The order of succession is not marked until afterwards (vv. 3, 5, 7).[9] — *ὡς φωνὴ βροντῆς*. Loose construction. The voice of thunder belongs to all four beings, because they are alike superterrestrial.[10] To the one of the four beings who speaks first, this voice is expressly ascribed, only because it is the first to speak. The thunder *note* of the voice has nothing to do with the *contents* of the first seal.[11] — *ἔρχου*. Even if the addition *καὶ βλέπε* were genuine,[12] a parallelizing of these words with John i. 40, 47 would be inapplicable, and a critical inference as to the composition of the Apoc. by the Evangelist John would be without foundation.[13] Not even is the note of Schöttgen[14] here applicable: "This formula, occurring in the Holy Scriptures only in John, is the well-known בא וראה of the rabbins. — They employ it, however, as often as at the close of a disputation one approaches who makes a declaration concerning the subject." The command *ἔρχου*[15] is very simple, and is seriously meant: "John is to come up;" viz., to see accurately what proceeds from the unsealed book. This is written immediately afterwards.

Ver. 2. John saw "a white horse, and he that sat on it had a bow; and

[1] C. a Lap., Stern, Vitr., etc.
[2] Cf. iv. 7 sqq.
[3] vi. 1-8.
[4] Cf. Ew., Hengstenb., Ebrard.
[5] Hengstenb.
[6] Luther, incorrectly: "I saw *that*" —
[7] Otherwise than v. 11.
[8] Against Ew. ii., etc.
[9] Cf. also Winer, p. 233.
[10] Cf. i. 10, x. 3.
[11] Against Hengstenb.
[12] See Critical Notes.
[13] Against Hengstenb.
[14] On John i. 47.
[15] Inconceivable, and in violation of the context, because of the immediately following *καὶ εἶδον*, is the reference of the *ἔρχου* here, as in vv. 3, 5, 7, to the appearance of the approaching horseman (against Klief.).

a crown was given unto him, and he went forth conquering and to conquer." The entire form is that of a warrior, and that, too, of one victorious, and triumphing in the certainty of victory. All the individual features of the image harmoniously express this. The horses of the Roman triumphers were white.[1] On white horses, therefore,[2] appear not only Christ himself, but also his hosts triumphing with him. — That the weapon of the horseman is a *bow*, not a sword, has scarcely a symbolical significance. The symbol would be distorted if Wetst. were correct in saying that by the bow, with which work is done *at a distance*, the intention is to indicate that the reference is properly to a victory, occurring at a distance from Judaea, of the Parthian king Artabanus II.,[3] who made war upon the Jews in Babylon; but if this were the meaning, the *entire* form of the horseman, which, in the manner proposed, is to represent that king, must have appeared at a greater distance. Arbitrary is also the explanation of Vitr.: "A bow, not a sword, in order to withdraw our thought from Roman emperors to Christ." If, as by Vitr., importance be laid upon the fact that the bow is pre-eminently peculiar to Parthian and Asiatic warriors in general, and not to the Roman, we dare not find in the bow an emblem of *Christ;* in order, then, to explain not so much the bow mentioned as rather the supplied darts of the numerous apostles and evangelists through whose forcible preaching Christ won his victory.[4] Instead of the bow, in Ps. xlv. 6, the darts are mentioned, and that, too, beside the sword (ver. 4), in a description which may have floated before John.[5] In this passage, what is ascribed to the bow can indicate nothing further than that the warrior equipped therewith may meet his foes also at a distance. — ἐδόθη αὐτῷ στέφανος. The crown — whose meaning, in connection with what immediately follows, is indubitable[6] — is given the warrior, because it is to be marked in the beginning directly, by this going forth, that he already goes forth as a νικῶν, and, therefore, that the goal of his going forth καὶ ἵνα νικήσῃ is undoubtedly reached. ℵ has even the interpretation: καὶ ἐνίκησεν. — The true meaning of this passage is suggested by the statement: κ. ἐξῆλθεν νικῶν καὶ ἵνα νικήσῃ, especially in connection with the succeeding forms of horsemen, but also still further in connection with the fundamental idea of the entire Apoc., particularly the parallel passages xix. 11 sqq., where, in perfect correspondence with the harmonious plan of the book, the form of a horseman comes forth still more gloriously, and at the same time is expressly explained. If we regard only the forms of horsemen proceeding from the three following seals, which, according to the unam-

[1] Cf. in general Virg., *Aen.* iii. 537 sqq.: "Quattuor hic, primum omen, equos in gramine vidi — *candore nivali*" ("Here, as the first omen, I saw four horses on the grass — *of snowy brightness*"). Beside this, Servius: "This pertains to the omen of victory." More of the same kind in Wetst.

[2] xix. 11 sqq.

[3] Joseph., *Ant.* xviii. 2, 9.

[4] Against Vitr.; also against Victorin., Beda, N. de Lyra, Calov., etc.

[5] Inapplicable is the comparison usual with the expositors, of the horsemen of vv. 2–8, with the horsemen and horses of Zech. i. 8 sqq., and the chariots, Zech. vi. 1 sqq., where neither the forms beheld, in themselves, nor the attached signification, agrees with the vision in our passage. Even the colors of the horses are not the same, much less their meaning (cf. Zech. vi. 6).

[6] Cf. 1 Cor. ix. 25. Incorrectly Züll., Hengstenb.: "regal crowns."

biguous hints in the text, are the very personifications of the shedding of blood (ver. 4), famine (ver. 6), and death (ver. 8), nothing is nearer than the opinion that even the first horseman is a personification, yet not of Christianity,[1] — to which not a single feature of the picture leads, even apart from the fact that, except in the person of Christ, a personification of Christianity is scarcely conceivable, — but of victory, or of war on the side of victory;[2] with which it would well agree, that, in vv. 3 sqq., war should be represented in its other sides and consequences. So, already, Bengel,[3] Herder, Eichh., Ew. ii., of whom the latter, like Wetst., limits the idea of the horseman to Judaea. According to this conception, De Wette[4] judges, with entire consistency, that the similar image of a horseman, referring to Christ,[5] is intended to be *antithetical* in its relation to the present; there at the end, Christ with his "spiritual victory," in opposition to the "vain boast of victory" of the warrior here at the beginning. But in the text there is no trace whatever of such contrast; that the victor here represented had, and wished to win, only a vain worldly victory, has as little foundation as it is unsatisfactory for Christ's victory to be called only a "spiritual" one, as even the external ruin of Babylon belongs essentially thereto. With correctness, most expositors[6] regard the horseman of the first, identical with that of xix. 11 sqq. The characteristic attributes are essentially synonymous. Yet in the one case we stand, of course, at the glorious end of the entire development of the kingdom of Christ, while here the Lord first goes forth to bring about that end; but just because only he can go forth to conquer, who is already a victor (*νικῶν*),[7] even here the form of the Lord is essentially the same as at the end. Since the very appearance of Christ reveals all the visions which proceed from the unsealed book of fate, it is indicated that he guides and determines the course and end of all the events portrayed in the succeeding visions; in the prophetic figures, also, which John beholds, as well as in the things portrayed, the Lord is the beginning and end, the First and Last, who will triumph over all enemies (*ἵνα νικήσῃ*), as he is already properly victor (*νικῶν*) over them. To any special victory of Christ, as possibly the results of the preaching at Pentecost,[8] the *νικῶν*, even because of the present form, cannot refer; in the sense of the Apoc., as also of the whole N. T., Christ is absolute victor over all that is hostile, just because he is Christ, i.e., the Son of God, who has suffered in the flesh, and arisen and ascended into heaven, or because he is the Lamb of God who possesses God's throne. The *νικῶν* presupposing the *ἐνίκησα*, iii. 21 (v. 5), and including in itself

[1] Stern.

[2] De Wette.

[3] Whose opinion, as a rule inaccurate, here is given, that he regards the first horseman as the Emperor Trajan. Beng. says expressly: "But Trajan is far too small to be such an horseman." Yet Beng. finds, even in Trajan, one and that too the first of the "conquerors," whose dominion and victory are represented by the first horseman: "By the horseman himself is represented a certain kind of worldly career, as throughout all time in government and the state, it is constantly attended by (1) a flourishing condition; (2), the shedding of blood."

[4] Cf., already, Beng.

[5] xix. 11 sqq.

[6] Victorin., Beda, N. de Lyra, Zeger, Grot., Vitr., Calov., Hengstenb., Ebrard, Böhmer, Klief., etc.

[7] Cf. v. 5, iii. 21.

[8] Grot., etc.

already the ἵνα νικήσῃ, designates also the true ground upon which believers in Christ are "to conquer," and can conquer, and have to expect from the Lord a victor's reward.[1] Thus the triumphing image of Christ at the beginning of all the visions, proceeding from the book of fate, is in harmony with the fundamental idea and paracletic tendency of the entire Apoc.

As little as the emblem of the bow, does the horse in itself or its white color have any special significance; any exposition that in such matters seeks any thing more than such emblems whereby the entire form of the horseman is characterized as that of a victorious warrior, and which proceeds to a special interpretation of the *individual* characteristic features, instead of regarding the unity of significance in the entire image, must result in what is arbitrary and frivolous. This is contrary to all the expositors, who understand by the white horse the Church,[2] and that, too, the apostolic primitive Church, in its purity and peaceful condition prior to persecutions, which are found in the second seal,[3] as Beda, Andr., Areth., N. de Lyra, C. a Lap., Calov., etc. [See Note XLVIII., p. 234.]

Vv. 3, 4. When the Lamb[4] opens the second seal, John is again commanded, and this time by the second of the beings, to come; it is therefore presupposed, that after the vision of the first seal had ended, and the first image of a horseman had vanished, he had again withdrawn, and taken his original place.[5] The form proceeding from the book of fate after the opening of the second seal (ἐξῆλθεν, cf. ver. 2) is that of personified shedding of blood. This is so obviously indicated by the *red* color of the horse,[6] whereby it was granted (ἐδόθη, cf. iii. 21) to take peace away from the earth with the effect of a slaughtering of one another by the dwellers upon earth,[7] and by the corresponding emblem of a great sword which was given (ἐδόθη, cf. ver. 2),[8] that expositors are united concerning the essential significance of the vision.[9] The more accurate determination of the intention of the threatening manifestation is given partly from the words ἐκ τῆς γῆς, and partly from the connection of the whole, decided already in the first sight of a seal. As ἐκ τῆς γῆς does not mean "from the land of Judaea, and the places in which there were Jews,"[10] certainly the vision as a prophecy *post eventum* cannot refer to the Jewish war, and the rapine and strifes of factions which occurred during its continuance, especially in Jerusalem.[11] Since, on the other hand, because of the connection of λαβ. τ. εἰρ. ἐκ τῆς γῆς and ἀλλήλους σφάξουσιν, only the κατοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς[12] can be regarded as subject to

[1] ii. 7, 11, etc.; cf. xxi. 7.

[2] "Over the church, made white by his grace beyond snow, the Lord presides" (Beda).

[3] Cf., e.g., Vitr.: "The white color designates that by his providence God will take care, that, at the time indicated by this seal, the Church shall have peace."

[4] Cf. ver. 1.

[5] Cf., also, vv. 5, 7. Ebrard.

[6] Cf. 2 Kings iii. 22; LXX.: ὕδατα πυρρὰ ὡς αἷμα.

[7] The ἵνα with the ind. fut., in the epexegetical clause καὶ ἵνα, κ.τ.λ., stands in combination with ἐδόθη αὐτῷ, just as the ἵνα after ποιήσω, iii. 9.

[8] It is to be noted how excellently the significant instrument, the μάχαιρα, applies to the slaying which is announced (σφάξουσιν; cf. ver. 6).

[9] Apart from individual, entirely untenable, arbitrary explanations, as in Alcasar.

[10] Grot.

[11] "Intestine dissensions, robbers, assassins, insurrection of Theudas," etc., Wetst.; cf. Herder, Böhmer, also Eich., Heinr., etc.

[12] iii. 10.

ἀλλήλους σφάξ., who kill *one another*, those massacred cannot be Christians, i.e., the discourse cannot be in reference to the persecutions of Christians; for then also, in reference to the combination of the first four seal-visions, it is entirely arbitrary to assert that the last three horsemen occupy a hostile position towards the first.[1] Incorrect, therefore, are all expositions which in the second seal-vision find the persecution of Christians; as well those specially expounding it,[2] as those holding it more or less in general.[3] On the contrary, as in Matt. xxiv. 7, 8, wars in the world are regarded as the first presage of the *parousia* of Christ, the ἀρχὴ ὠδίνων, so there appears here the personification of the shedding of blood, which is to occur on earth in consequence of the Lord's approach for the glorious and victorious end. Even sanguinary war serves the Lord at his coming. Believers, too, are of course alarmed by the πειρασμός which is thus proclaimed by the second seal-vision;[4] but their Lord not only preserves them, but at the signs of his coming they are to be the more confident in their hope, since their redemption approaches.[5]

Vv. 5, 6. The meaning of the third seal-vision is to be determined according to the same norm as that of the second. The *black* color of the horse designates not the grief of those who have been afflicted by the plagues indicated by the entire image of the horseman,[6] especially not the grief of the Church over heresy, as it is symbolized by the horse and horseman; but the black color must correspond to the destructive character of the image of the horseman itself.[7] Yet it is not perceptible how, by this color, the particular nature of the plague announced, viz., famine, is expressed:[8] it is sufficient to regard the black color[9] as an indication that the figure appearing therein is one of a plague, a servant of divine judgment. — First, the special emblem ascribed to the horseman (ἔχ. ζυγὸν, κ.τ.λ.), in addition to the unambiguous exclamation χοῖνιξ σίτου, κ.τ.λ., makes us recognize in the third figure of a horseman the personification of famine. — ζυγόν. As to the expression, ζυγός means properly the beam which unites the two scales, cf. Prov. xvi. 11; as to the subject itself, since by the weighing of the grain which otherwise is measured, famine is represented, cf. Lev. xxvi. 26, Ezek. iv. 16. — ὡς before φωνὴν[10] corresponds with the circumstance that, to John, the person from whom the voice proceeds[11] remains unknown.[12] "*Audivi ut vocem*," a Latin would say; i.e., "I heard (something) like a voice." That the cry sounds forth "in the midst of the four beings," is, in itself, natural, since the unsealing of the book of fate occurs at the throne of God, which is in the

[1] "*Against* the victorious and conquering Church, a red horse goes forth, i.e., an unfavorable populace, bloody from their rider, the Devil" (Beda).

[2] e.g., N. de Lyra: "The red horse is the Roman people; the rider is Nero."

[3] e.g., Beda, Zeger, Calov.: "The red horse, an unfavorable people, an assembly of the godless; the rider is the Devil." Cf. also Andr., Areth., Laun., Vitr., who regard the rider a personification of the Roman Empire, and suggest Decius and others; Stern, who, in the entire form of each personification, sees only the worldly power thirsting for the blood of Christians, etc.

[4] Cf. iii. 10.

[5] Hengstenb., Ebrard, also Beng., Ew., De Wette.

[6] De Wette, Hengstenb., etc.

[7] Cf. vv. 2, 4, 8.

[8] Beng. [9] Cf. ver. 12.

[10] See Critical Notes.

[11] Cf. i. 12.

[12] Cf. ix. 13, x. 4, 8, xiv. 13, xviii. 4.

midst of the four beings;[1] but as it is not without significance that the four beings, as representatives of the living creatures on earth, cry out to John, ἔρχου, so is it likewise significant that in the midst of those beings the cry sounds forth, which accompanies the figure of a plague pertaining to living creatures [2] The first half of the call sounds just as when any thing is offered for sale.[3] The gen. δηναρίου is that of the price.[4] The second sentence contains a command which prescribes to the horseman, not only as the personification of the famine, but as the bearer of the visitation, the limit of the plague ordained by the Lord. Oil and wine are to grow as ordinarily: μὴ ἀδικήσῃς, i.e., "Do them no harm, injure them not;"[5] although wheat and barley, and therefore the unconditionally necessary means of subsistence, are to be so dear that a day-laborer for his daily labor receives a denarius,[6] nothing more than daily food for himself, — a *choinix* of wheat, which is a man's[7] daily nourishment. If, therefore, the famine indicated do not reach the utmost extreme of hunger,[8] yet the grievousness of the plague is obvious to every one who has learned to know the life of the people, viz., of the lower classes, in the neighborhood. That oil and wine remain exempted, is, of course, a mitigation of the famine; but on the other hand, by the plentiful presence of these two means of nourishment, even though in Oriental life they are luxuries far less than among us, the πειρασμός lying in the famine which had entered is essentially strengthened, and the critical force also of these plagues in an ethical respect, which belong to the signs preceding Christ's coming,[9] intensified.

The reference of vv. 5, 6, to the famine under Claudius,[10] or to any other particular dearth,[11] is decidedly contrary to the sense of the text; since here, as also in vv. 3, 4, and ver. 7 sqq., no special fact is meant, especially not one predicted only after its occurrence, but rather, in accord with the fundamental prophecy (Matt. xxiv. 7), a certain kind of plagues is described,[12] which precede the coming of the Lord. Purely arbitrary is the allegorizing interpretation, e.g., in Beda,[13] Vitr.,[14] C. a Lap.,[15] Stern,[16] etc. N. de Lyra understands by the black horse, the Roman army; by the horseman, Titus; by the wheat and barley, Jews; by oil and wine, Christians. The acme of arbitrary interpretation is attained by those who, as even Böhmer, understand the wheat and barley properly, and the wine and oil figuratively as a designation of Christians. Any such distinction would have been indicated

[1] iv. 6, v. 6.
[2] Cf. also Hengstenb.
[3] Winer, p. 456.
[4] Winer, p. 194.
[5] Cf. vii. 2, 3, ix. 4, 10, 19, ii. 11.
[6] Matt. xx. 2.
[7] Cf. Wetst.
[8] Cf. Joel i. 10 sqq.
[9] Matt. xxiv. 7. Hengstenb. incorrectly judges, that the famine, vv. 5, 6, does not belong to the λιμοί, Matt. xxiv. 7, but is "the *prelude* of that fulfilment."
[10] Grot., Wetst., Harenb., Herd., Böhm.
[11] Cf. Calov., Bengel, Huschke.
[12] Cf. De Wette, Hengstenb., Ebrard.
[13] "The black horse is the band of false brethren, who have the balance of a right profession, but injure their associates by works of darkness."
[14] "Dearness of spiritual provision, viz., in the time from Constantine until the ninth century."
[15] ἵππος = a heretic, as Arius; ὁ καθήμ. = the Devil, or heresiarch; ζυγός and χοῖνιξ = Holy Scripture; δηναρ. = the merit of sound faith and of daily holy life; σιτ. = the gospel; κριθ. = the harsh old law; ἔλ. and οἶν. = the medicine of our Samaritan Christ.
[16] Personified erroneous doctrine.

by the omission of the art. with *σίτου* and *κριθῶν*, whereas, on the other hand, it is found with *ἔλαιον* and *οἶνον*. But although the art. in the latter case designates simply the class as a whole, this is lacking in the former case just as naturally; since there not the kind of fruit as such, but a quantity, is mentioned, which therefore allows no other designation than that of the mass, which in simple composition is given as *χοῖνιξ σίτου*.

Vv. 7, 8. The fourth form of horseman is recognizable not only by the entire description, but also his name is expressly mentioned: *ὄνομα αὐτῷ ὁ Θάνατος*. The text is thus as contradictory as is possible to all allegorizing interpretations of mortal heresy,[1] of the complete falling away from Christ as spiritual death,[2] of the Saracens and Turks,[3] of the Roman people with the Emperor Domitian, whom "Hell follows," because immediately after his death he entered it.[4] Incorrect, also, as in vv. 5, 6, is the limited reference of the whole to any special case, as possibly to the diseases and rapine which occurred at the time of the Jewish war in consequence of the famine (vv. 5, 6),[5] or to the devastations made by the *flavi Germani*, and other nations of the migration.[6] As already by the ancient prophets, in addition to the sword[7] and hunger,[8] pestilence[9] and also wild beasts[10] were called grievous divine judgments, so the Lord also enumerates pestilences (*λοιμοί*) among the signs of his coming. Yet it does not follow thence that the horseman, who has the name *ὁ Θάνατος*, is the plague;[11] but it corresponds with those types, that death personified, just as the shedding of blood personified, and famine personified, should enter because of the Lord's going forth to his victorious goal, and that the means mentioned (ver. 8) should ascribe to him deadly efficacy. This horse has the color which agrees with his work. *χλωρός* designates not only the fresh green of the grass,[12] but also the greenish pallor of fear[13] and of death.[14] — *ὁ καθήμενος*. The loose but forcible construction in which the preceding nom. is absorbed by the following dat. (*ὄν. αὐτῷ ὁ Θαν.*), as in iii. 12, 21. — *καὶ ὁ Ἅιδης ἠκολούθει μετ' αὐτοῦ*. The *μετά* with *ἀκολ.* as Luke ix. 48. To understand Hades by metonymy for the inhabitants of Hades, the host of those swept away by death,[15] is an assumption which not only gives a monstrous idea, but also especially avoids the correct reading *ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς*. The incorrect explanation, as well as the incorrect reading *αὐτῷ*, depends upon the failure to recognize the fact that Hades, i.e., the place belonging to death,[16] because filled by the agency of death, is represented here like death itself, as a person following death. The idea of locality, which especially belongs to Hades, is also in i. 18 decisive as to the idea of death; conversely here and in xx. 13 sqq., Hades is personally considered, which suits better the idea of death. But to regard Hades only as the place

[1] Beda, who mentions especially Arius; Zeger, etc.
[2] Stern.
[3] Vitr., C. a Lap.
[4] N. de Lyra.
[5] Wetst., Grot., Herd., Böhmer.
[6] Huschke.
[7] Cf. v. 3 sqq.
[8] Cf. ver. 5 sqq.
[9] דֶּבֶר. LXX.: *θάνατος*, Jer. xxi. 7, xiv. 12.
[10] Lev. xvi. 22; Ezek. xiv. 21.
[11] "*Pestis nomine mortis*" (Eichh.).
[12] viii. 7, ix. 4; Mark vi. 39.
[13] *Il.* vii. 479.
[14] *Pallida mors.*
[15] Eichh., Ebrard.
[16] Cf. i. 18, xx. 13 sqq.

of torment for the damned,[1] is only possible if the plagues indicated in ver. 8 are misunderstood as though pertaining to unbelievers alone. The contrary is decided partly by the entire tendency of all four seal-visions, and partly, especially in this place, by the express extension of the dominant power granted death and hell following it, to the fourth part *of the earth*, and therefore of all inhabitants of the earth, believers — who have patiently endured and hoped for the coming of the Lord — as well as unbelievers.[2] — τὸ τέταρτον. The schematic number gives the idea of a considerably great portion of the whole; a still greater part is designated by the schematic three.[3] — ἐν, as a designation of the instrument or means,[4] stands properly with ῥομφαίᾳ, λιμῷ, and θανατῷ; while to θηρίων, as the beasts themselves are active, ὑπό is attached,[5] which in other cases also is combined in classical Greek with the active.[6] The ῥομφαία, ver. 8, has as little to do with the μάχαιρα, ver. 4, as the λιμός concurs with the famine, vv. 5, 6; on the contrary, such means to kill are to be ascribed to Death personally portrayed with Hell, as already in the O. T. are threatened as destructive means of punishment prior to God's judgment. Because of the juxtaposition of ἐν θανάτῳ with ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ and ἐν λιμῷ, the θανάτῳ is readily taken specially as a designation of the plague, especially as the LXX., in similar connections, use θάνατος where the Heb. text has דֶּבֶר;[7] but if John had wished to designate this precise idea, the expression λοιμός[8] would scarcely have escaped him. As in ii. 23, the general conception must be maintained also in this passage,[9] which also appears the more suitable as the ἐν θανάτῳ occurs in a certain exclusive way to the two preceding conceptions which are likewise furnished with the prep. ἐν, while the attached ὑπὸ τ. θηρίων τ. γ., as also the change of prep. shows, connects it again with a certain independence to the three preceding conceptions. [See Note XLIX., p. 235.]

Vv. 9–11. We might expect that also the fifth seal would bring a vision of the same kind as the three preceding seals and the one succeeding; viz., a representation of such dispensations of God as proclaimed and prepared the final coming of the Lord. Those expositors who, in all the individual members of the Apoc., find only individual prophecies of definite events in the history of the world and the Church, have interpreted the contents of the fifth seal also accordingly. If, e.g., according to Vitr., the fourth seal has introduced us to the appearance of the Saracens, the fifth seal speaks of the times of the Waldenses, and extends to the century of the Reformation. The martyrs who cry for vengeance are the Waldenses, Albigenses, etc. The white robes given them designate their vindication by the Reformation, even though, ere the final judgment come, this, too, must deliver up its martyrs (ver. 11). Bengel knew how to find the same reference, even by a computation; for if in the year A.D. 97 or 98, in which John received his revelation, the martyrs who were slain by heathen Rome cried for vengeance, and it was told them that they must wait yet "a chronus," i.e., a space of

[1] Hengstenb.
[2] Beng., Ew.
[3] viii. 7.
[4] Cf. ii. 16.
[5] Cf. Ew., De Wette.
[6] Matth., *Ausführ. Griech. Gramm.*, § 592.
[7] Vitr., Beng., De Wette, etc.
[8] Matt. xxiv. 7.
[9] Hengstenb., Ebrard.

1,111⅑ years, their fellow-servants who were afterwards to become martyrs (through Papal Rome) are the Waldenses of the year 1208 (i.e., 97 + 1111).

The meaning of the fifth seal-vision in connection with that preceding and following, and corresponding with the idea of the entire book, does not lie in the fact that any special future event is prophesied, whereof the preceding seals treat as little as those which follow; but in that both the cry of the souls of the martyrs for vengeance on account of the shedding of their blood, and also the answer given them, stand in most definite relation to what is even in the seal-visions the invariable goal of Apocalyptic prophecy, viz., the prophetic announcement that the Lord cometh. Already the circumstance, that, to the gazing prophet, the martyrs whose blood has been shed show themselves, contains a sign of the coming of the Lord.[1] But if the martyrs cry for vengeance, there is in this a certainty that a day of judgment is impending, which their unbelieving persecutors have called forth by their ungodly deeds. Finally, the divine answer (ver. 11) contains the certain assurance of the future final judgment; it is only added thereto, that all they who, like those already offered, are to endure the martyr's death, must first be slain, and, consequently, the sign of the final judgment already fulfilled on those crying for vengeance be fulfilled also on these. In its more immediate relation to the preceding seal-visions, the present mentions, that, after the fulfilment of what is announced in ver. 8, the final judgment will not immediately follow; but the meaning of the fifth seal is stated too narrowly, and regarded too unimportant, if thereby we only find something expressed which is self-evident already from the preceding visions.[2]

Εἶδον ὑποκάτω τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου τὰς ψυχὰς, κ.τ.λ. The question, how John could have *seen* the souls, is asked only when it is forgotten that it is not a seeing of sense, but of a vision, which is here treated; the explanation that the souls had a body[3] is not only false, but also entirely unnecessary. — That the altar *under* which[4] John sees the souls of those slain is to be regarded after the manner of an earthly burnt-offering,[5] is indicated especially by the ἐσφαγμένον, — the uniform word for the slaying of animals for sacrifice, — and the *alμα*, ver. 10, as it is accordingly also the expression of the whole, affording what is simplest, and, in every respect, most applicable. As the blood of the sacrifices was sprinkled at the foot of the altar of burnt-offerings,[6] so also those souls who have offered themselves to the Lord[7] are under the altar, upon which they can be represented as offered in a way very similar to that in which, in viii. 3 sq., the prayers of saints on earth appear as a heavenly offering of incense. But it is incorrect, when De Wette fully explains this passage from viii. 3 sqq., by regarding the altar in this place

[1] Matt. xxiv. 9; cf. ver. 7, whose contents we have found in the second, third, and fourth seals.

[2] Against Hengstenb., Ebrard.

[3] "Invested with a subtile body," Eich.

[4] ὑποκάτω. Beng. incorrectly, "Beside the altar, and beneath its ground," for the type of Lev. iv. 7 cannot change the meaning of the expression in this passage.

[5] Grot., Vitr., Beng., Ew., Hengstenb., Ebrard.

[6] אֶל־יְסוֹד, Lev. iv. 7. LXX.: παρὰ τὴν βάσιν, ἐπὶ τ. β., v. 9.

[7] Cf. Phil. ii. 17; 2 Tim. iv. 6. Ignat., *Ep. ad Rom.*, II. iv.: one who goes to meet a martyr's death will become a θυσία.

as an incense-altar, "beneath which the souls of the martyrs lie, because they are awaiting the hearing of the prayers which are offered in the incense." The latter reference of the *ὑποκάτω τ. θυσ.*, in itself strange, is, besides, in no way based upon viii. 3. The occasion because of which the souls are regarded *under* the altar is given by the fact that the blood of sacrifices, to which the martyrs are regarded as belonging, was shed under the altar. But hence it does not follow, that by the expression *τ. ψυχὰς τ. ἐσφ.*, nothing else properly is designated than blood, the bearer of physical life, and that the entire representation is only a dramatizing of the thought: Their blood demands vengeance, according to Gen. iv. 10;[1] the souls are here, without doubt, as xx. 4, the spirits of those whose bodies have been slain upon earth.[2] — Without any support are the allegorizing interpretations of *ὑποκάτω τ. θυσ.*, as "in the communion of Christ."[3] It is also utterly contrary to the meaning of the entire vision, if any dogmatic result be derived concerning the abode of souls after death, in connection with which the *ὑποκατ. τ. θυσ.* is, with complete arbitrariness, variously interpreted: "in the solitary place of eternal praise;"[4] "reserved as to their bodies until the day of judgment, in the most holy place."[5] What has been cited in this respect from rabbinical writings,[6] corresponds not even as to the form of the conception. — *διὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ διὰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἣν εἶχον.* Already it has been noted on i. 9, that as *τ. θεοῦ* belongs to *τ. λόγον*,[7] just so the *Ἰησοῦ* placed there and in xii. 17, xix. 10, xx. 4, with *τ. μαρτυρίαν*, is not an objective but a subjective gen. Accordingly the *μαρτυρία* in this passage is not to be understood as a testimony borne by the martyrs and sealed with their blood,[8] but as one given them.[9] This is required, even apart from the parallelism of the preceding *τ. λογ. τ. θ.*, by the addition *ἣν εἶχον*, whereby the idea is presupposed that the martyrs have first received[9] the *μαρτυρία* "which they *had*."[10] [See Note L., p. 235.] Cf. the similar *τηρεῖν*, xii. 17; John xiv. 21. The *ἡ μαρτυρία (Ἰησοῦ)* is here identical, therefore, with that of i. 9, and throughout the entire Apoc. it remains generally unchanged; but in this passage the *ἐσφαγμ.* and the addition *ἣν εἶχον* entirely change the force of the *διά* from what the same word has in i. 9, because of an entirely different connection. — *ἔκραξαν.* That it is not precisely the *αἱ ψυχαὶ τῶν ἐσφ.*,[11] but, according to a very easy mode of presentation, rather *οἱ ἐσφαγμένοι*, which is regarded as subject,[12] follows not necessarily from the masc. *λέγοντες*,[13] but indeed from the entire mode of expression, vv. 10, 11.[14] — *ὡς καὶ αὐτοί.* For this, of course, Hengstenb.'s false interpretation of *τ. ψυχάς*, ver. 9, affords no aid. — *φωνῇ μεγάλῃ*, cf. i. 10. — *Ἕως πότε.* עַד־מָתַי, 1 Sam. xvi. 1; cf. Hab. i. 2;

[1] Züll., Hengstenb.
[2] Matt. x. 28.
[3] Vitr., Calov., Boss., etc.
[4] Beda.
[5] Zeger.
[6] Debarim, R. xi.: "God said to the soul of Moses, 'I will place thee *under the throne of my glory*.'"
[7] Cf. xii. 17: *τ. ἐντολάς.*
[8] = *μαρτ. περὶ Ἰησοῦ.* Cf. Acts xxii. 18. So the older expositors; also Ew. i., De Wette, Bleek.
[9] Viz., of the Lord Jesus, who himself has testified to them. Cf. Hengstenb., Ebrard.
[10] Ewald, incorrectly: "which they firmly held."
[11] Ebrard.
[12] Hengstenb.
[13] Cf. iv. 8.
[14] *αἷμα ἡμ.* — *αὐτοῖς ἑκάστῳ ἐρρ.* — *αὐτοῖς* — *οἱ συνδ. αὐτ. κ. οἱ ἀδελφ. αὐτ.*

Ps. xiii. 2, lxxix. 5. Every attempt to supply[1] breaks the immediate connection with *οὐ κρίνεις, κ.τ.λ.* — *ὁ δεσπότης*. On the voc. use of the nom., see Winer, p. 172. The correlate to *δεσποτής* — the expression only here in the Apoc. — is *δοῦλος*.[2] All belonging to the Lord are his servants;[3] hence the future martyrs are called *σύνδουλοι*. Cf. also xix. 10. The one meant as "Lord" is not Christ,[4] but God. "The martyrs cry to God as their owner."[5] But because he is this, there can be no doubt that the punishment here expected[6] has begun; only the question *ἕως πότε, κ.τ.λ.*, proceeds from the longing of the martyrs for that judgment. And the martyrs may the more confidently expect that judgment from their Lord, as he is *ἅγιος* and *ἀληθινός*. His holiness[7] is the essential ground from which the *δίκαιαι κρίσεις*[8] energetically proceed. But it is improper to refer the *ἀληθινός*, which is exchanged with *ἀληθής*, to God's truthfulness or fidelity to his promises,[9] while, on the other hand, God is called *ὁ δεσπ. ὁ ἀληθινός*, because he is the Lord who in truth deserves this name, the "true Lord,"[10] who, therefore, will also doubtless do in every respect as is fitting for such a Lord to do to his faithful servants. [See Note LI., p. 236.] *οὐ κρίνεις καὶ ἐκδικεῖς, κ.τ.λ.* Concerning the following *ἐκ*,[11] cf. xviii. 20, xix. 2; Ps. xliii. 1; 1 Sam. xxiv. 13.[12] — The dwellers "on the earth"[13] are here, by virtue of the connection,[14] according to the generic view, "all nations,"[15] in contrast with the servants of God.[16] — Concerning the ethical estimation of the expressed longing of the martyrs, which contains neither censurable impatience nor a vindictive feeling, Beda already remarked: "These things they did not pray from hatred towards enemies for whom in this world they entreated, but from love of justice with which they agree as those placed near the Judge himself."[17] Especially in accordance with the text, Beng. says, "They have to do with the glory of the holiness and truth of their Lord." What the martyrs express as their longing, is in reality pledged by the fact that their *δεσπότης* is *ἅγιος καὶ ἀληθινός*; the *κρίνειν* and *ἐκδικεῖν* are the infallible attestation of his nature, which has been just before praised. But the longing which the martyrs express in *their* way is, in its foundation, nothing else than that which belongs to the *entire* Church.[18] — *καὶ ἐδόθη — στολὴ λευκή*. The singular *στολὴ λ.*, which even with the mere *αὐτοῖς* would not be irregular,[19] is immediately afterwards made necessary by the expressly individualized *ἑκάστῳ*. — The opinion that by the offering of the white robe,[20] something peculiar is to be communicated to the souls of martyrs, besides the blessedness which is

[1] N. de Lyra: *quies*.
[2] Cf. Luke ii. 29; 1 Tim. vi. 1; 1 Pet. ii. 18.
[3] Cf. i. 1.
[4] Vitr.; Grot., who, besides, with utter inappropriateness remarks, "All this dispensation of patience and severity in regard to the Jews has been delivered to Christ."
[5] Beng.; cf. Ew., etc.
[6] And celebrated in its fulfilment, in xix. 2.
[7] "Because he cannot endure crimes," Vitr., Ew.
[8] Cf. xix. 2.
[9] Vitr., Beng., Ew., De Wette, Hengstenb.
[10] Cf. iii. 14.
[11] = מִן. Cf. Ew., *Gr. d. hebr. Spr.*, § 519.
[12] Luke xviii. 3: *ἀπό*, as the var. of this passage.
[13] Grot., incorrectly: "in Judæa."
[14] Cf. xiii. 8, 14.
[15] Matt. xxiv. 9.
[16] Cf. Hengstenb., Ebrard.
[17] Cf. N. de Lyra, C. a Lap., Calov., Beng., Hengstenb., Ebrard.
[18] Cf. xxii. 17, 20.
[19] Winer, p. 164.
[20] Cf. iii. 5.

self-evident,[1] is not only in itself indefinite, — for, what is this special reward to be? — but is also contrary to the context; not because this giving of white garments, as also the entire scene vv. 9–11, is nothing more than "a poetic fiction," [2] — for the fifth seal-vision is this no more than are the rest, — but, because the giving occurs within the vision, it is an integrant part of the vision, and not an objective, real fact. The consideration that the souls of martyrs are already blessed, and, therefore, as all the blessed, they wear already white garments,[3] is therefore entirely out of place, because dependent upon a *μετάβασις εἰς ἄλλο γένος*.[4] — As the gift of the white robe designates the already present blessedness and glorification of those who have been offered for the sake of Christ, so also the fulfilment of their prayer is promised them in the final revelation of the Lord's judgment which is to be awaited, but, of course, in such a way that they are to wait for it in their blessed repose until the end which is no longer distant (ver. 11). — *καὶ ἐρρέθη αὐτοῖς ἵνα, κ.τ.λ.* Concerning the *ἵνα*, cf. Winer, p. 314 sqq. — *ἀναπαύσωνται* designates not the mere cessation from the cry (ver. 10),[5] but has the more complete sense of the blessed rest, as xiv. 19,[6] which, as also the white robe indicates, has been imparted to the martyrs, after having struggled in their earthly life, even unto death, and overcome.[7] — *ἔτι χρόνον μικρὸν.* Bengel's reckoning concerning the length of the "chronus" is thwarted already by the correct reading, *χρ. μικρόν*,[8] whose meaning corresponds with the entire view of the Apoc.[9] — *ἕως πληρωθῶσιν, κ.τ.λ.* A definition of the "little season" from its actual contents, and at the same time in accord with the preceding question *ἕως πότε, κ.τ.λ.*, ver. 10. The relation according to the context of *πληρωθῶσιν* comprises the words *οἱ μελλ. ἀποκτ., κ.τ.λ.*: "*should be fulfilled*," viz., as to their number,[10] must be only those who are still to suffer a martyr's death, just as the number of those who in ver. 10 have called is already full. The completeness is therefore not to be understood of that sum and these martyrs,[11] but to be limited to the future martyrs. Thus this explanation of *πληρωθ.* is simpler and more significant than that preferred by De Wette, according to whom *πληροῦσθαι*[12] means either only "to finish life," or at the same time is to have the secondary sense of a moral fulfilling.[13] Hengstenb. adopts the easier reading *πληρώσωσιν*.[14] — *οἱ σύνδουλοι αὐτων.* Beng., incorrectly: "The first martyrs were mostly of Israel; their fellow-servants were, in following times, from the heathen, their *brethren* outside of Israel." The future martyrs are rather fellow-servants of those mentioned in ver. 9 sqq., because of their identical relation to the *δεσπότης* (ver. 10), than brethren because of the fellowship of all believers with one another.[15] The *καὶ* before *οἱ συνδ.* marks the fate impending *also* over the fellow-servants; the succeeding *καὶ* serves as a simple connective of a still further designation.[16]

[1] Beng.
[2] Hengstenb.
[3] Cf. vii. 13 sqq.
[4] "Transition to another class."
[5] Beng., De Wette.
[6] Cf. also Mark vi. 21, xiv. 41.
[7] Cf. Hengstenb.
[8] See Critical Notes.
[9] Cf., especially, i. 1–3.
[10] Wolf, Ebrard.
[11] Against De Wette's objection.
[12] Cf. Zech. iv. 13: *τελειοῦσθαι*.
[13] Cf. Heb. xi. 40, xii. 23: *τελειοῦσθαι*. Cf. also Vitr.
[14] Sc. *τὸν δρόμον*, Acts xx. 24; 2 Tim. iv. 7.
[15] De Wette, Hengstenb., etc.
[16] De Wette, etc.

Ver. 12–17. The sixth seal-vision. As the visions portrayed, vv. 3–8, have presented the signs of his coming, announced by the Lord himself in his eschatological discourse (Matt. xxiv. 6 sqq.), and as, also, the fifth seal-vision stands in close connection with Matt. xxiv. 9, so the sixth vision brings what is found in Matt. xxiv. 7 (*σεισμοὶ κατὰ τόπους*), and especially the signs predicted in ver. 29, which[1] refer to the immediate entrance of the day of judgment itself.[2] Incorrect, therefore, because of the connection with what precedes, not only does that explanation appear to be, according to which the entire description, vv. 12–17, refers to the Jewish-Roman war, and the "great day of wrath," ver. 17, is regarded as nothing else than the destruction of Jerusalem;[3] but, also, that which seems to be directly the opposite, yet which actually depends upon a similarly arbitrary treatment, as well as also, in many particular interpretations, the harmonious exposition of allegorizing expositors from Victorin. to Hengstenberg,[4] who in the earthquake, the darkening of the sun, etc., find *figurative* prophecies of certain events pertaining to the development of the Church, etc. If the reference of the entire vision be limited to the destruction of Jerusalem, it is, of course, more natural in ver. 12 (*ὁ ἥλ. ἐγ. μελ., κ.τ.λ.*) to think of an eclipse of the sun and moon at the time of Claudius,[5] than, with Böhmer, to interpret sun and moon as prophecy and the law; but even Grot. cannot adequately represent the context, since he refers to the falling of the stars, ver. 13, as a prognostic of terrible events derived from the notions of the time, and on *ὁ οὐρανὸς ἀπεχ., κ.τ.λ.*, he has to remark: "Because of thick clouds, the heavens cannot be seen."[6] In arbitrariness of allegorical interpretation, Böhmer[7] vies with Victorin., Beda, Vitr., Hengstenb., etc. The earthquake, ver. 12, is made to signify "great revolutions in political or ecclesiastical spheres;"[8] the sun becoming black is intended to be "the blasphemed Christ,"[9] "prophecy,"[10] "worldly emperors and kings;"[11] the blood-red moon, "the Church reddened by the blood of martyrs,"[12] "the law,"[13] "spiritual princes;"[14] the fallen stars, "the fallen, exalted church-teachers,"[15] the "Jews who desert the true Church for corrupt Judaism, which is signified by the earth;"[16] the mountains and islands are "prophets and philosophical pursuits,"[17] etc. The whole refers, according to Vitr., to the destruction of the papal dominion, and the fearful disturbances in the political governments of Europe which were attached to the Papacy.[18] Hengstenb. is distinguished from these interpreters only by indecision. The earthquake, the eclipse of sun and moon, the falling of the stars, etc., are to him figurative of "grievous and disturbed times," which impend by God's judgment over his enemies. "Heaven," e.g., he says

[1] Cf. vv. 16, 17, with Matt. xxiv. 30 sqq.; Luke xxiii. 30.
[2] Cf. Ew., De Wette, Ebrard.
[3] Grot., Wetst., Alcas., Herd., Böhmer.
[4] Cf. Beda, N. de Lyra, Aret., Zeger, Vitr., etc.
[5] Grot.
[6] Cf. also Eich.
[7] Cf. Alcas., etc.
[8] Böhm., Vitr.
[9] N. de Lyra, Aret.,
[10] Böhm.
[11] Vitr.
[12] N. de Lyra, Aret.
[13] Böhm.
[14] Vitr.
[15] N. de Lyra, Aret., Vitr.
[16] Böhm.
[17] Aret.
[18] Cf. xvi. 17 sq.

on ver. 13, "is the heaven of princes, the entire magisterial and sovereign estate. The stars are individual princes and nobles." This *figurative* explanation is regarded as necessary "because the falling from heaven of the stars, generally so called, would destroy every thing, while, in what follows, the races of the earth appear as still existing;" to which Ebrard objects: "The shaking down is only from the standpoint of the appearance to human vision; while the human eye sees the stars sinking as stars to earth, yet must they in reality sink, and pass far from the earth in the void expanse."

The context itself should have been a sufficient protection from all these aberrations; for here, just as in the preceding seal-visions, the simple admonition is entirely valid, that every thing portrayed in vv. 12–17 is the subject of a vision, and not something objectively real. In the vision, John beholds as the stars fall to the earth (*εἰς τ. γην*, not "in the expanse"). The consideration, how after such an event men can still live upon earth, is here utterly strange, and contrary to the context. For the sixth seal-vision concludes with the express testimony, that — as also its entire contents, in harmony with Matt. xxiv. 27 sqq., indicate — the day of final judgment has come, and is now present.[1] There is, therefore, actually, — i.e., if that which was shown in vv. 12–17 in vision to the gazing prophet occurred at the end of days, — no further life of the human race on this earth any longer possible, as, with the destruction of the world (vv. 12 sqq.), the day of the Lord begins. The signs are made known: *ὅτι ἐγγύς ἐστιν ἐπὶ θύραις*.[2] Already also the unbelieving note that the day of wrath has come (ver. 15 sqq.). It may accordingly be expected that the seventh seal is opened immediately after ver. 17; and thus to the seer is shown the judgment itself, with its condemning and its beatifying influence. That this does not happen now,[3] but that first of all ch. vii. is still placed before the seventh seal, and that then, again, the last seal itself brings an entire series of visions, can interfere with the clear meaning of the sixth seal-vision the less, as the further development has the correct meaning just as it has been given.[4]

σεισμός. As xi. 13, xvi. 18, viii. 5.[5] Earthquake;[6] not indefinitely, "trembling,"[7] for it is not at all said that by this *σεισμός* the heavens shall be shaken. — *ὡς σάκκος τρίχινος*. Cf. Isa. l. 3. — *ὡς αἷμα*. Cf. Joel iii. 4. — *τ. ὀλύνθους*. Hesych: *ὄλυνθος, τὸ μὴ πεπαμμένον συκον*.[8] Cf. Cant. ii. 13. פַּגִּים, Winer, *Rwb.*, B. I., 429. — *ὁ οὐρανὸς απεχωρίσθη ὡς βιβλίον ἑλισσόμενον*. Cf. Isa. xxxiv. 4. The idea that the firmament itself, from which the stars fall,[9] gradually vanishes,[10] is illustrated by the rolling-together of a book, since the heaven, the firmament, appears stretched out like tent-canvas.[11] — *πᾶν ὄρος, κ.τ.λ.* As in xvi. 20, a quaking is indicated, overthrowing the foundations of the earth, and therefore final: no mountain, no island, remains on its old place. The destruction is complete. — Also, thereby, that terror

[1] *ἦλθεν*, v. 17. [2] Matt. xxiv. 33.

[3] Although in fact from the seventh seal, the entire rest of the prophecy, even that of the final judgment corresponding to the fundamental plan of v. 1 sqq., proceeds.

[4] Cf. Introd., sec. 1, and on ch. vii. 8.

[5] Cf. Isa. xiii. 13.

[6] Hengstenb.

[7] De Wette.

[8] *ὄλυνθος*, the fig not ripened.

[9] Cf. Gen. i. 14 sqq.

[10] Departs: *ἀπεχ*. Vulg.: *recessit*. Incorrectly, Ew. ii.: "was rent in a place."

[11] Isa. xl. 22; Ps. civ. 2.

now seizes (ver. 15) all, without exception, who have to fear the judgment; and by the way in which they make known their amazement (ver. 16 sqq.), especially by the express words *ὅτι ἦλθεν, κ.τ.λ.*, it is clearly indicated that the subject from ver. 12 is the opening of the final judgment. — *οἱ βασιλεῖς, κ.τ.λ.* The *κατοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*, in the sense of ver. 10, is here, as in xix. 18, so introduced, that they appear not only collectively,[1] but that the significant classification, at the same time, proves how no kind of earthly greatness or power, the previous cause of insolent assurance, can afford any protection whatever.[2] Kings share the anguish with the humblest slaves.[3] In addition to *βασιλεῖς τ. γ.*, the proper rulers,[4] *οἱ μεγιστᾶνες*, are first mentioned. The expression, belonging to the later Greek,[5] presents here[6] high civil officers, especially courtiers,[7] in distinction from chief commanders (*χιλίαρχοι*). In addition to the *πλούσιοι*, distinguished by wealth, are the *ἰσχυροι*,[8] not "the mighty of every kind,"[9] but[10] such as excel in physical strength[11] — *ἔκρυψαν — ὀρέων*. Those alarmed, even unto despair, seek in the mountains and rocks not so much ineffectual protection,[12] as rather, as their own words show,[13] death through which to escape the impending judgment of wrath.[14] — *ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ καθ., κ.τ.λ.* The style is of such kind as to bear without doubt in ver. 16, as well as in ver. 17, traces of John's own peculiar feeling. The *ἀπὸ προσώπου*[15] is biblical; the *τ. καθημ. ἐπὶ τ. θρ.* and the *οργ. τ. ἀρνίου* refer back to ch. iv. 5; the expression *ἡ ἡμ. ἡ μεγ. τ. ὀ. αὐτ.* depends upon Joel iii. 4, i. 15, ii. 2, Isa. lxiii. 4, etc.; and the question *τίς δυν. σταθῆναι*, on Nah. i. 6, Mal. iii. 2.[16] Yet the entire discourse, even though ver. 17 be not regarded the words of John, has its truth in the mouth of unbelievers, since, just as they must recognize the Lord himself when he will appear,[17] so also will they discern in the terrible signs (ver. 12 sqq.) the commencement of the day of judgment.

Notes by the American Editor.

XLVIII. Ver. 2. *ἵππος λευκός.*

Luthardt: "That is, the Word of God, which was the first in the history of N. T. times to pass victoriously through the world, and whose words flew far like arrows, and penetrated the heart (Ps. xlv. 6)." Alford: "The *νικῶν* might be said of any victorious earthly power whose victories should endure for the time then present, and afterwards pass away; but the *ἵνα νικήσῃ* can only be said of a power whose victories are to last forever. . . . We must not, on the one

[1] Cf. Matt. xxv. 32: *πάντα τὰ ἔθνη.*

[2] Klief. understands from erroneous presuppositions (see on i. 20) "no blind heathen, but the masses of baptized nations who have fallen into Laodicean feelings."

[3] Cf. also Bengel, Hengstenb., Ebrard.

[4] Cf. Acts iv. 26.

[5] xviii. 23; Mark vi. 21; cf. LXX. Jer. xiv. 3; Neh. iii. 10; Isa. xxxiv. 12; Dan. v. 1.

[6] Cf. Mark vi. 51; Dan. v. 1.

[7] Ebrard, etc.

[8] Var.: *δυνατά.*

[9] Ebrard; "prevailing in influence," Ewald.

[10] Cf. xix. 18, v. 2, x. 1, xviii. 8, 21, also xviii. 2, 10, xix. 6.

[11] Cf. Ps. xxxiii. 16 sqq., cxlvii. 10; Ew. ii.; warriors, according to Jos. x. 2; 1 Kings xi. 28.

[12] Cf. Isa. ii. 10 sqq.

[13] ver. 16; cf. Hos. x. 8; Luke xxiii. 30.

[14] Cf. Hengstenb., Ebrard.

[15] Beng.: "The face against them that do evil," Ps. xxxiv. 17.

[16] Cf. Ewald, etc.

[17] Cf. i. 7.

hand, too hastily introduce the person of our Lord himself; or, on the other, be startled at the objection that we shall be paralleling him, or one closely resembling him, with the far different forms which follow. Doubtless, the resemblance to the rider in xix. 11 is very close, and is intended to be very close. The difference, however, is considerable. There he is set forth as *present* in his triumph, followed by the hosts of heaven: here he is working in bodily absence, and the rider is not himself, but only a symbol of his victorious power, the embodiment of his advancing kingdom as regards that side of its progress where it breaks down earthly power, and makes the kingdom of the world to be the kingdom of our Lord and his Christ. Further, it would not be wise, nor, indeed, according to the analogy of these visions, to specify. In all cases but the last, these riders are left in the vagueness of their symbolic offices. If we attempt, in this case, to specify further, e.g., as Victorinus: 'The white horse is the word of preaching sent with the Holy Spirit into the world. For the Lord says, This gospel shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations, and then shall the end come,' — while we are sure that we are thus far right, we are but partially right, seeing that there are other aspects and instruments of victory of the kingdom of Christ besides the preaching of the word." If the word "preaching" be limited to public discourses, or even to the public reading and private study of the word, Alford is quite right. But just as the sacraments are only the visible word, and are efficacious because of the word of God joined with them, so every agency for the diffusion of Christ's kingdom may be reduced to the word of God under some form. Gebhardt (p. 238) regards the rider on the white horse as a personification of victorious war. His objection to the view adopted by Düsterdieck, that the Lamb could not have opened the seals, and at the same time have been represented in what the seal portrays, is not very formidable, and, at most, would not interfere with the conception above proposed of the Word as rider.

XLIX. Vv. 2–8.

Alford regards the four seals, in their fulness, as contemporaneous, the *ἵνα νικήσῃ* not being accomplished until the entire earth is subjugated, although "they may receive continually recurring, or even ultimate, fulfilments, as the ages of the world go on, in distinct periods of time, and by distinctly assignable events. So far, we may derive benefit from the commentaries of those who imagine that they have discovered their fulfilment in successive periods of history, that, from the very variety and discrepancy of the periods assigned by them, we may verify the facts of the prevalence of these announced judgments hitherto, throughout the whole lifetime of the Church."

L. Ver. 9. *τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἣν εἶχον.*

The interpretation of our author is thus criticised by Lange: "There is an exegetical obscureness here. The testimony is a specific term. The gospel which a man receives from Christ is not, in itself, a specific testimony or witness. It becomes testimony by faithful confession; and then, doubtless, Christ confesses himself to the man by whom he is confessed. Here, however, the holding fast of confessors to their confession is denoted." So Alford: "The testimony is one borne by them, as most commentators; not one borne to them

by the faithful Witness, as Düsterdieck and Ebrard most unnaturally; for how could the testimony borne to them before the Father, by Christ, be the cause of their being put to death on earth?"

LI. Ver. 10. *ἀληθινός.*

Liddell and Scott give, as the ordinary meaning of this word in classical Greek, when applied to persons, "truthful, trusty." So, in Cremer, the second and very frequent meaning: "That which does not deceive, which bears testing." "Here it is too evidently intended of subjective truthfulness, for the other meaning even to be brought into question; and it is wonderful that Düst. should have insisted on it."

CHAPTER VII.

Ver. 1. *Μετὰ ταῦτα.* The *καὶ* (ℵ) prefixed in the rec. is properly deleted by Lach., in accordance with A, C, Vulg., al. Tisch. has retained it here, but not in xviii. 1, xix. 1. In the rec. also, it is lacking in ver. 9, iv. 1. Yet it is certain in xv. 5. — The form *ταῦτα* (Elz.) is attested, of course, only by the Vulg., while the *τοῦτο*, approved by Lach., Tisch., has the preponderating witnesses (A, C, ℵ, 2, 4, 6, al.) in its favor; but the plural stands in all similar passages (De Wette). On the other hand, the *πᾶν* before *δένδρον* (ℵ, rec., Tisch. IX.), in spite of the analogy of ix. 4, xxi. 27 (De Wette), must yield to the unexpected, but, indeed, well-attested, *τι δενδρ.* (Lach., Tisch.), to which also the emendation *τινι δένδρῳ* (19, Wetst.) points. — Ver. 2. *ἀναβαίνοντα.* So already Beng., Griesb., Matth., according to all witnesses. Incorrectly, Elz.: *ἀναβάντα.* — Ver. 3. *ἄχρι σφραγ.* A, C, ℵ, 12, Beng., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]. Without witnesses: *ἄχρις οὐ σφρ.* — Ver. 5. *ἐσφραγισμένοι*, according to the preponderating witnesses, belongs only in the first member of ver. 5, and at the close of ver. 8 (Lach., Tisch.). — Ver. 9. *εἶδον ὄχλον πολύν.* So Lach., in accord with A, Vulg., Primas, Cypr. Tisch. with Elz. has written *εἶδον, καὶ ἰδοὺ ὄχλος πολύς* (ℵ), for which C is cited, whose authority, however, with respect to this passage, is weakened by the evident emendation of the *ἑστῶτες* into *ἑστώτων* (cf. the variations *ἑστῶτας, ἑστῶτα*, in Wetst.). — Ver. 11. Instead of *ἑστήκεσαν* (Elz.), either *ἑστήκεισαν* (Beng., Tisch.), or more probably, as Matt. xii. 46 (cf. Tisch., ed. vii.), *εἱστήκεισαν* (Matt., Lach., Tisch. IX.) is to be read. The latter form occurs in 6, 14, 16, 27, 28, Compl., al. (Wetst.), and in four codd. in Matt. A has, according to Lach., *ἵστηκεισαν*; C: *ἑστήκισαν*; ℵ: *ἵστηκισαν.* Wetst. cites A, C, 2, al., for *ἑστήκεισαν* [W. and H.: *ἱστήκεισαν*]. — Ver. 14. After *κύριε*, a *μου* is inserted in the rec., in accord with the decisive witnesses, by Beng., Griesb., Matth. The reading received by Lach., *ἀπὸ θλίψεως μεγάλης*, is, indeed, attested by A; but there is reason to suspect that the reading *ἐκ τῆς θλ. τῆς μεγ.* (ℵ, Elz., Tisch. [W. and H.]) has been changed, because the restriction of the *θλῖψις* required by the art. appeared difficult. — After *ἐλεύκαναν*, neither *στολὰς αὐτῶν* (Elz. [W. and H.]) nor *αὐτὰς* (A, ℵ, Vulg., Lach., Tisch. IX.) is to be read. Beng., Matth., Tisch., already have rejected the repeated designation of the object. — Ver. 17. *ζωῆς.* So, according to decided witnesses, Beng., Griesb., Matth., al., N. The *ζῶσας* (Elz.) is a modification. Instead of *ἀπὸ τ. οφθ.* (ℵ, Elz., Matth.), read *ἐκ* (A, C, 2, 4, al., Beng., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]).

After the conclusion of the sixth seal-vision, and before the description of the final judgment itself, to be expected in the seventh seal, whose immediate signs are presented in the sixth seal, although already the executors of this final storm of judgment, directed against the entire earth, stand prepared for their work (ver. 1), "the one hundred and forty-four thousand servants of God" (ver. 3) who are *of Israel*, are first sealed with a "seal of the

living God" (vv. 1–8). Afterwards, in the second part of ch. vii. (vv. 9–17), John beholds in a new vision an innumerable company *from all men* (ver. 9), in white robes and with palms in their hands, who stand before the throne of God and of the Lamb, and unite with all the angels in songs of praise. According to the express interpretation of ver. 13 sqq., they are such as "have come out of great tribulation," and who, as a reward for their fidelity to their faith, in which they have victoriously endured great tribulation, are refreshed with heavenly joy before God and the Lamb.

The meaning of ch. 7, as a whole, depends less upon the correct exposition of details, than in general upon the correct statement of the intention and plan of the Apoc. Hence the following chief points must be firmly maintained, which must receive their full justification by the explanation of each several verse: —

1. The view of Vitringa is incorrect, that, as vi. 12–17 describes the first part of the sixth seal-vision, so vii. 1–8 describes its second, and vii. 9–17 its third part.[1] For not only is the section vi. 12–17 perfectly complete in itself, and, as to its contents, homogeneous with the preceding seal-visions, while in ch. vii. such matters are represented as, because of their entirely different nature, belong not to the seal-visions vi. 12 sqq.; but the vision vii. 1 sqq., and the succeeding ver. 9 sqq., are expressly distinguished from what precedes, by the formula μετὰ ταῦτα εἶδ.[2] Ch. vii., therefore, contains an episode,[3] inasmuch as it enters with a certain independence between the sixth and seventh seals (viii. 1 sqq.); in both its parts, two pure visions, immediately presented to the prophet, occur, which do not proceed from a seal. — 2. The question now arises, whether the twofold vision has its reference to what precedes, — whether to the sixth seal,[4] or the fifth,[5] or all six,[6] — or to what follows, and what meaning belongs to the entire ch. vii. in its order and contents. The answer to this question depends essentially upon what meaning is attached to the act of sealing, and what relation the one hundred and forty-four thousand sealed (vv. 1–8) are regarded as holding to the innumerable multitude (vv. 9–17). It is a constant assumption of expositors, — as well of those who identify the sealed with the innumerable multitude, as those also who make a distinction, — that the sealing has as its purpose, to establish the sealed before the impending visitations, so that they may not, like unbelievers, experience them.[7] An appeal is made for this to Exod. xii. 7, 13; Ezek. ix. 4 sqq.; Rev. ix. 4. But this traditional interpretation is not correct. In neither Exod. xii. nor Ezek. ix. is there any thing said of a σφραγίζειν, but of a sign (σημεῖον), which, whether it be applied to the houses (Exod. xii.), or the foreheads of men (Ezek. ix.), has as its expressly designated end to assure those thus marked of the impending judgment. Undoubtedly the seal pressed upon the foreheads (vv. 2, 3) could be a σημεῖον given for a like purpose; but that this is actually the case,

[1] Cf. also C. a Lap.

[2] Cf. already Beng.

[3] Eichh., De Wette, Hengstenb., Ebrard, etc.

[4] Vitr.

[5] Ewald.

[6] Hengstenb.

[7] C. a Lap., Stern, Vitr., Beng., Eichh., Heinr., Ew. i., De Wette, Bleek, also his *Introduction to the N. T.*, p. 610, Hengstenb., Ebrard, Hilgenfeld, etc.

is in no way said in this passage, and also does not follow from ix. 4,— where, as a matter of course, the sealed were not to be afflicted with certain plagues, yet not because they as sealed are secure from *all* plagues, but because, as the sealed servants of God, they could not be attacked by any plague proceeding "from the abyss,"—but rather contradicts as well the N. T. eschatology in general,[1] as the prophecy of the Apoc. in particular, which admonishes only to patient steadfastness unto the end, and by the promise of eternal life can incite to conflict and victory in all temptations and troubles,[2] because it presupposes[3] that the servants of God can in no way remain untouched by all the sorrows which befall the world. The impossibility of carrying through this interpretation of the sealing is immediately seen, when the one hundred and forty-four thousand sealed are to be determined in themselves, and their relation to the innumerable multitude, ver. 9 sqq. One class of expositors[4] refers vv. 1–8 to the flight of Christians[5] from Jerusalem to Pella, whereby they avoided (= ἐσφραγισμένων)* the distresses occasioned by the siege and fall of Jerusalem. The innumerable multitude of ver. 9 is, according to Alcas., Böhmer, etc., identical with the one hundred and forty-four thousand; according to Grot., the Christians in Syria[6] are meant; but in any case, in vv. 9–17, the peaceful life, attended with all its wants, of those secured against the dangers and sorrows of the Jewish war, is described. The unbounded arbitrariness of this exposition,[7] Heinrichs already sought to avoid by maintaining that in vv. 1–8 are to be understood not only those who fled to Pella, but all Jewish Christians up to the final judgment; besides this correct reference to the final judgment, he has also obtruded upon the text the view that the innumerable multitude, vv. 9–17, appears in *heavenly* glory. Thus Heinr. says that here (vv. 9–17) the Jewish Christians who perished *in spite of the sealing* in the judgment that entered (cf. ver. 14) appear in heaven as beatified victors; so that, therefore, "the innumerable multitude of all nations and tongues" is to be understood a part of the one hundred and forty-four thousand sealed out of Israel, while the sealing itself is to be regarded as partially ineffectual. But while the expositors just named, in all the defects of their mode of explanation, have correctly understood at least the one point, that the sealing has occurred because of a judgment to be expected after vi. 12–17, and also declared in vii. 1 as still impending, and accordingly ch. vii. with its *prospective* reference has its correct position between the sixth and seventh seals, Vitr., Hengstenb., and, in a certain respect, Ew. also, have attempted to explain the meaning of ch. vii. by making what Augustine, Tichonius, and many older expositors in general, call a *recapitulatio*.[8] Even in these interpreters, the view concerning the meaning and reference of the two visions, ch. vii., is inseparably combined with the conception that the sealing effects an exemption from the visitations upon the world, and with the manner in

[1] Cf. Matt. xxiv. 20 sqq.
[2] Cf. only the epistles, chs. ii. and iii.
[3] Cf. already ver. 14.
[4] Alcas., Grot., Wetst., Heinr., Böhmer, etc.
[5] Jewish Christians, ver. 4 sqq.
[6] "Syria was *full* of Christians."
[7] Cf., viz., the particulars in vv. 1, 9, 11, 14, 16.
[8] Cf. Introduction, p. 13 sqq.

which the relation of the one hundred and forty-four thousand sealed, to the innumerable multitude, is determined. According to Vitringa, vii. 1–8 belongs properly before vi. 12–17, because in vii. 1–8 it is described how the one hundred and forty-four thousand of Israel, i.e., of the true Israel in the mystic sense, the true Church of the purer evangelical profession,[1] are to be placed in security from the judgments stated in vi. 12–17, and to be introduced by the angels mentioned in vii. 1, while in vii. 9–17 the same sealed persons appear as an innumerable multitude in heavenly glory, after the execution of the judgment, vi. 12–17 (vii. 1 sqq). Hengstenb. also carries us back, in vii. 1, to the point where no judgment whatever has come upon the world, therefore, before the six seals, and regards the declaration made as to how the spiritual Israel (ver. 4 sqq.), with whom all believing Gentiles are "affiliated," consequently the entire Christian communion of saints, are rendered secure against all the judgments that come upon the world; but yet, since the guilt of the world is not something "absolutely alien" to the children of God, as they also have sin, and consequently — notwithstanding the sealing, — must suffer with the world, it is stated in vii. 9–17, how "the best comes at the end," i.e., the one hundred and forty-four thousand secured against the sorrows appear as a "relatively" innumerable multitude, who are consoled and refreshed before God's face after their victorious endurance of suffering. The contradictions involved in this mode of explanation are obvious: those who by the sealing are rendered secure against the sufferings, endure the sufferings; the numbered are innumerable; those from the twelve tribes of Israel are of all lands and languages: and upon such contradictory propositions depends the supposition that what is beheld in ch. vii. *after* the six seal-visions (*μετὰ ταῦτα*, ver. 1, and again in ver. 9), in reality should belong *before* all those visions,[2] — a supposition against which, therefore, the text in every way conflicts. Ew., in common with most interpreters,[3] has correctly acknowledged the prospective position of ch. vii. to the seventh seal; only as far as he maintains a retrospection of vii. 9 sqq. to vi. 11, as he regards the innumerable multitude as the completed band of martyrs spoken of in the fifth seal. Yet, as Ew. aptly remarks, the section vv. 9–17, thus understood, has an identical relation with the first vision to the seventh seal, in which retributive punishment is to be expected, inasmuch as in vv. 1–8 the sealing, i.e., the securing of Israel,[4] before the beginning of the judgments is represented; while in vv. 9 sqq., it is indicated that meanwhile that has happened which was still to be expected after vi. 11, and before the entrance of the day of judgment, viz., the completion of the number of the martyrs. Thus Ewald's view makes its claim not so much with respect to the relation which he gives in general to ch. vii., as rather because of the determination of the innumerable multitude in itself, and its connection with the one hundred and forty-four thousand sealed. The sealed also he now interprets more correctly.

That those mentioned in ver. 9 are identical with the one hundred and

[1] The Evangelical are meant in distinction from Roman Catholics.

[2] Hengstenb.

[3] Cf. Alcas., Beng., Eichh., De Wette, Rinck, Ebrard, Christiani, etc.

[4] Ew. ii.: "The elect," Matt. xxiv. 22, 24, 31.

forty-four thousand, vv. 1–8, and that in both places Jewish and heathen Christians are meant,[1] De Wette especially has attempted to prove: 1. "Because no reason can be conceived why only Jewish, and not heathen Christians, should be kept from those plagues." If this be in itself correct, it will show that even though in vv. 4–8 only Jewish Christians be meant, yet the heathen Christians are not inferior in that which their sealing actually signifies. 2. "The writer of the Apoc. makes no distinction between Jewish and heathen Christians, and sometimes designates Christians as Israel, sometimes as the elect of all nations and tongues,[2] or of the earth."[3] — Only the latter assertion is correct and self-evident, and not the former, with which especially the controversy concerning vv. 4 sqq. is connected, that "Israel," without any thing further, designates in the Apoc. the entire Israel of God;[4] in this passage, the name Israel can the less be understood otherwise than in the most immediate sense, i.e., to the exclusion of heathen Christians, as the individuals belonging to the individual tribes of Israel are mentioned directly afterwards.[5] 3. "Just as the kingdom of God is regarded as Jerusalem,[6] and its gates are marked with the names of the twelve tribes,[7] so Israel is to him, viz., the true Israel of God,[8] Christian people.[9] Just so the twelve tribes, Matt. xix. 28, Jas. i. 1." — But it is something different when the kingdom of God, in its heavenly completion, is designated by the name of the ancient city of God, — and in general, where a vivid description thereof occurs, this is given with the express features of the O. T. Church of God, while, at the same time, the tenor of the description as a whole, as well as in its individual parts, shows how in individual points, to whose higher significance the typical substratum of historical relations is transformed, — from when the name of Israel is used, under the special representation of the twelve tribes, concerning those, as is undoubtedly the case in vv. 1–8, who are to be sought on earth. 4. "Those here designated are called, ver. 3, absolutely, the servants of God; and in xiv. 1 sqq. they appear as redeemed, either from the earth or from men." — All these designations suit Israel,[10] which comprises the servants of God in a pre-eminent sense; but if in vv. 1–8 only the Jewish and not also the heathen Christians appear as the servants of God, the sealing communicated with respect to this relation, in like manner as in respect to only Jewish Christians,[11] must show upon what ground this occurs, and how,

[1] Cf. also Kliefoth, p. 539: "All servants of God who are to be at the end of days." In *Comment.* ii. p. 108: the one hundred and forty-four thousand are the entire body that is to be protected, the œcumenical people of God; "and in distinction from these are the multitude of many individuals whom even that protection could not save from death."

[2] v. 9, vii. 9.

[3] xiv. 3.

[4] Gal. vi. 16.

[5] From the fact that the tribe of Dan is lacking, the inference is not impossible, that the designation of Israel, together with the names of the tribes mentioned, is intended figuratively or mystically, i.e., the entire assembly of believers is designated, even the heathen Christians added to the spiritual Israel by adoption (Hengstenb.). Why, then, should not the spiritual Dan belong to the spiritual Israel? But if Israel proper be meant, the proper Dan would not be mentioned if the tribe were as good as dead. See on vv. 4–8.

[6] xx. 9, xxi. 2.

[7] xxi. 12.

[8] Gal. vi. 16.

[9] Cf. xviii. 4.

[10] Cf. on xiv. 1 sqq.

[11] Cf. Nr. 1.

in fact, there is in the text no trace of the seeming slight to heathen Christians. 5. "Those coming forth, vii. 9, are not such as have been *preserved* from the calamities, but have *escaped from* the same, ver. 14; hence their coming forth belongs to a later period, and a parallel occurs between this passage and the former, only in the manner wherein here what is spoken of is the preservation, and there the deliverance as its consequence." — This proposition depends upon the false presumption that the "sealing" is a preservation from calamity, upon the transformation of the present ἐρχόμενοι, ver. 14, into a preterite, and the confused conception of ver. 14 in general.[1]

The grounds upon which an attempt is made to show the identity of those mentioned in vv. 1–8 with those meant in vv. 9–17, by understanding in both passages Jewish and heathen Christians together, are, therefore, not such as stand the test:[2] the text leads to the opposite view, because, in vv. 1–8, what is said has reference to Israel with its tribes, but in vv. 9 sqq. to all nations and tongues, because the number of one hundred and forty-four thousand there, although not literal but schematic, furnishes the idea of numerability, while here (ver. 9) the innumerability of the great multitude is especially emphasized; and also because what is spoken of there is the sealing, which is not mentioned here. The question therefore is: Who are those mentioned in vv. 1–8, and who those in ver. 9 sqq.? The distinction is sometimes made between Jewish Christians (ver. 1 sqq.) and Gentile Christians (ver. 9 sqq.);[3] or Jews to be converted at the end of the world,[4] and Gentile Christians;[5] or Jewish and Gentile Christians still living at the end of the world on the judgment day, and those who have died the death of the godly before the judgment day:[6] but in connection with all these explanations,[7] we see neither any firm foundation in the text, nor the meaning and relation of the visions in connection with the whole. The latter is lacking also in Bengel, who, however, has correctly discerned the chief point, that vv. 1–8 treat only of believers from Israel, and ver. 9 sqq., of the glorified of *all* nations, Gentiles and Jews.

Especially as to the "sealing," the generally received explanation of it as the protection, or guaranty as to security, from the imminent plagues that were to come upon the world, necessarily results from the symbol in itself, or from its use in the N. T., and especially the Apoc. mode of statement, as little as that received meaning is justified by the facts; for the servants of God do not remain entirely untouched by all the sufferings whereby judgment comes upon the world. But as the seal serves for the attestation,

[1] For, on ver. 14, De Wette remarks that those mentioned there are delivered, "by their steadfastness," from the distress which they still had to endure notwithstanding their "sealing."

[2] Cf. Bleek, who in his *Beitr.*, p. 186, has recalled his former view of the identity of those expressly mentioned (ver. 1 sqq. and ver. 9 sqq.).

[3] Eichh., etc.

[4] Cf. Rom. xi. 25.

[5] C. a Lap. Cf. Hofmann.

[6] Stern, Rinck, Ebrard.

[7] To be silent concerning what is utterly wonderful, as in Aretius: "In ver. 1 sqq., they are meant who publicly profess Christ, as Christians in almost all Europe; ver. 9 sq., they who do not publicly profess Christ's name, as innumerable Christians in Asia and Africa, whom Christ preserves. How he does this without external preaching, he himself knows."

as, e.g., of a document,[1] and, in general, for confirmation, so in this passage the sealing of those who already are servants of God designates nothing else than the immutable firmness of their ἐκλογή,[2] which is not to be affected even by the πειρασμός[3] of the last great θλῖψις.[4] Striking analogies to this interpretation of the σφραγίζειν are 2 Cor. i. 22; Eph. i. 13, iv. 30.[5] To the servants of God, therefore, upon whose forehead the seal of the living God is impressed, the Divine warrant is thereby given that in the greatest tribulations they remain the servants of God, until they have been preserved in their fidelity unto the end, and are victoriously conducted to eternal glory in God's kingdom. The seal designates, therefore, not preservation from tribulation, but preservation in tribulation *from a fall*.

But even with this conception of the σφραγίζειν, the difficulty arises, that if the one hundred and forty-four thousand sealed of Israel are not also of the Gentiles, the latter seem subordinated to the former in an inexplicable way.[6] This difficulty is thus removed in accordance with the context: 1. While, in respect to the servants of God from Israel, the guaranty is given in advance by the special act of sealing, that the tribulation (of the seventh seal) now entering is not to turn them from their heavenly Lord (vv. 1–8), the same thing is represented in respect to the servants of God from the Gentiles, in that (vv. 9–17) an innumerable multitude *of all* nations, kindreds, and tongues, therefore of Jews and Gentiles, appear as those who "have come out of great tribulation" (ver. 14), and now stand as triumphant victors before the throne of God for no other reason than because they have persevered unto the end in the same fidelity as the sealed from Israel. 2. But that this is thus said in a twofold way, first of Israel alone, and then of all true servants of God, including those of Israel, has its foundation in the fact that inasmuch as the judgment to be expected, — in the seventh seal, — although only one comprising all enemies, yet contains two chief acts: viz., first, the punishment inflicted upon the great city, which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, where the Lord was crucified, i.e., Jerusalem;[7] then the judgment upon the spiritually so-called Babel, i.e., Rome, — in the tribulation with which the Lord comes in judgment upon unbelieving Israel, the one hundred and forty-four thousand servants of God are to be kept in security, even though they are to suffer; thus the vision, vv. 1–8, looks towards what the seventh seal is to bring upon unbelieving Israel.[8] But that also the servants of God from the Gentiles, together with the one hundred and forty-four thousand sealed from Israel, are to come out of great tribulation, and to enter glory as faithful warriors of Christ, the other vision states, which thus refers to the tribulation with which the Lord shall visit Babylon.[9] At the critical point, therefore, between the sixth and seventh seals, before the seventh seal, which is to show the coming itself of the

[1] Cf. Esth. viii. 8.

[2] Cf. Matt. xxiv. 22–24, where especially the εἰ δυνατόν is to be observed.

[3] Cf. iii. 10.

[4] Cf. ver. 14.

[5] Cf. also Rom. xv. 28; John iii. 33, vi. 27; 1 Cor. ix. 6; Rom. iv. 11.

[6] Volkm. and similar critics see here the decided Judaism of John.

[7] Cf. xi. 8.

[8] Cf. viii. 1–xi. 14.

[9] Ch. xii. sqq.

Lord, is opened, the double vision of ch. vii. enters, whereby testimony is given, in the most express way, that all the tribulation impending over the true servants of God is not to occasion their fall, but that from this tribulation, which brings judgment upon the world, they are to come to eternal glory. 3. That in this sense a special sealing was given the servants of God from Israel, and not the Gentile Christians, is natural, because the concrete form of the people of Israel with its individual tribes suggests the more definite idea of a complete mass, and, therefore, of one to be comprised in a (schematic) number; but if the look turns to the servants of God from the heathen, the limitation vanishes, the multitude appears innumerable (ver. 9), and the idea of a special sealing imparted to all individuals would be entirely untenable. 4. But if what is said in ver. 9 sqq. be not only of the servants of God from the heathen, but in the innumerable multitude wherein the one hundred and forty-four thousand sealed are to be regarded as included, this depends upon the fact, that, even though a special reference to the Israelites has a good foundation, yet the final equality and fellowship of all believers in heavenly glory must be made prominent.

Ver. 1. *τέσσαρας ἀγγέλους.* We must here think neither of wicked angels,[1] nor of angels of the wind, after the analogy of the angel of the water, xvi. 5,[2] but of angels in general, to whom the office here described has been given, ver. 2,[3] just as angels afterwards appear with trumpets and vials. Without any foundation are the allegorical interpretations, as in Beda,[4] and N. de Lyra, who proposes Maximian, Severus, Maxentius, and Licinius,[5] while the other angel, ver. 2, is regarded as Constantine. — *ἑστῶτας — γῆς.* The position of the angels corresponds with their occupation: *κρατοῦντας — γῆς.* The four corners of the earth (*τὰς τέσσ. γών, τοὺς τέσσ. ἀν.*) are the points from which the four winds of the earth go forth.[6] John beholds the four angels as they still hold the winds,[7] to prevent them from blowing (*ἵνα μὴ πνέῃ ἀν., κ.τ.λ.*); but according to what immediately follows, the situation is such that the angels are ready to let loose the winds as soon as the purpose of the other angel, who is already rising up (ver. 2 sqq.), is accomplished. — If also "the four winds of the earth" be interpreted allegorically, although the expression sounds as unallegorical as possible, — of which examples have just been given, — then also the earth, the sea, and the trees must be understood figuratively. For thus Grot. says on *τ. γῆς*: "viz., Judaea;" on *ἀνέμους*: "The winds signify any sort of calamity." The "sea" is "a great people, such as is that of Jerusalem especially;" the trees designate "what come from trees, as cities, but especially the temple:" in general, the times of peace under King Agrippa are meant. Böhmer regards the "earth" as

[1] Aret., Zeger, Laun., Calov., Beng., Rinck, etc.

[2] Alcas., C. a Lap., Stern, Heinr., Züll., De Wette.

[3] Vitr., Ewald, Hengstenb., Ebrard.

[4] *τέσσ. ἀγγ.* = "the four principal kingdoms of the Assyrians, Persians, Greeks, and Romans;" *κρατ. τ. ἀνεμ.* = "They allow no one to breathe according to the pleasure of his own right;" *γῆ* = "diversity of provinces;" *δένδρ.*: "diverse quality of men."

[5] "Hindering the doctors of the Church from preaching the word of God." Cf. similar interpretations of *κρατ. τ. τεσσ. ἀνέμ.*; e.g., in Aret., who regards the wicked angels as the Pope, the Turks, etc.

[6] Cf. Jer. xlix. 36; Zech. vi. 1 sqq.; Dan. vii. 2.

[7] *κρατ.* Cf. ii. 1, iii. 11.

Jews, the "sea" as heathen; therefore he says that the Christians still to be mentioned are designated by the "trees." According to Beng., the earth is Asia, the sea Europe, the trees Africa. Hengstenb. also regards "the four winds of the earth" as symbols of the Divine judgments, viz., those described in ch. vi.; the "sea" designates masses of people; the "trees" are magnates, vi. 15. — But every kind of allegorizing is without the least foundation in the text. The winds which in their proper naturalness are, besides, expressly designated as "the four winds of the earth," are not once personified here, as in Zech. vi. 1 sqq., — where, however, what is said dare not be taken as an allegory in the strict sense, — but as in vi. 4 an actual shedding of blood, and in vi. 12 an actual earthquake, so here actual winds are meant, storms which are to have the mastery of the whole earth, as they are also ready to break loose from all four ends of the earth. But in the fact, that, after the dreadful signs of the sixth seal have led immediately to the day of the final judgment, now — as the description of this judgment is to be expected in the seventh, last seal — a visitation of like character, as in the sixth seal, is again set forth, and its infliction restrained until after the sealing of the servants of God from Israel, the intimation is already given that the actual occurrence of the final catastrophe will not be until after the course of a still further manifestation of preliminary afflictions, as they proceed from the seventh seal in long and connected sequence.[1]

Vv. 2, 3. *ἄλλον ἄγγελον.* That an angel — not an archangel[2] — is to be thought of,[3] not Christ,[4] to be silent concerning the Holy Spirit,[5] results not only from the appellation *ἄγγελος*, but especially from the fact that this *ἄλλος ἀγγ.* is designated in the clearest way by the contrast with the angels mentioned in ver. 1, as of a different nature. The mode of expression also, ver. 3, *τ. δουλ. τ. θεοῦ ἡμῶν*, suits most simply the mouth of an angel, not of Christ.[6] Cf. especially viii. 3, x. 1, xiv. 6, 8, 9, 17, xviii. 1. — *ἀναβαίνοντα ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς ἡλίου.* John, therefore, sees how the angel comes forth,[7] while the first four angels stand already in their places as he looks upon them; the angel now entering will take part in the act. The expression *ἀπὸ ἀνατ. ἡλίου* admits of no allegorical meaning; the annexed *ἡλίου* renders impossible the interpretation of the *ἀνατολή*, with a vague allusion to Luke i. 78, as referring to Christ,[7] so as to make the sense that the other angel is sent by Christ or God.[8] The quarter of the heavens, the east, is designated; but not because of the look towards Judaea,[9] or to "Patmos, and especially the Christian lands where the light of the gospel first shone,"[10] which is here out of place; not "because the Hebrews always turned first towards the east,"[11] whereby properly nothing is explained; not because the throne of God whence the angel proceeds[12] is

[1] Cf. Introduction, p. 12 sqq.

[2] Stern.

[3] C. a Lap., Grot., Beng., Eichh., Ew., De Wette, Rinck, Ebrard.

[4] Beda, Aret., Zeger, Calov., Böhmer, Hengstenb.

[5] Vitr., who interprets the seal used by this "angel" as "the public profession of the purer faith" wrought by the Spirit.

[6] Cf. already Beng.

[7] Grot.

[8] Calov.

[9] Wetst.

[10] Stern.

[11] De Wette.

[12] Ew. ii.: "As though, by the Divine commission, he had commanded the sun to shine no longer with such excessive heat, but to

regarded as in the east,[1] for that is nowhere indicated in the Apoc.; nor because, as plagues have their origin in the east, "for the earth (viii. 7) is Asia," so also the sealing:[2] but because it is appropriate and significant that the angel, coming for a victorious employment which brings eternal life, should arise from that side from which life and light are brought by the earthly sun.[3] The angel himself, who does not descend from heaven, but rises from the horizon,[4] is represented after the manner of the rising sun. — *ἔχοντα*, cf. i. 16. — *σφραγῖδα θεοῦ ζῶντος*. Without meaning[5] is the metonymy accepted by Grot.: "The sealed constitution of the King." The angel has a seal (in his hand) which he will press upon the foreheads of the servants of God. The gen. *θεοῦ ζ.* designates simply, that the seal belongs to the living God; that it "has been delivered by God,"[6] is, therefore, self-evident, but not expressed. The attempt has been made to conjecture the legend of the seal. Beda, C. a Lap., Grot., Böhmer, regard it the sign of the cross; with more probability, Eichh., Ew., De Wette, Ebrard, etc., propose the name of God and of the Lamb.[7] But since the text says nothing, nothing can be inferred.[8] As the definite article is absent, the idea is left open that there are different seals of God for different purposes. In this passage, the mark made by the seal, upon the foreheads of the servants of God, does not mean what the *χάραγμα* indicates, which the worshippers of the beast receive upon the forehead or the right hand,[9] viz., the belonging to one Lord and serving him;[10] for they who receive the seal are already "servants of God." The question is as little as to the fact of their being recognized and outwardly shown to be servants of God, or "that they receive the letter and seal to their being servants of God,"[11] as that they are rendered secure from the approaching sufferings, but that, notwithstanding the approaching suffering, they are guaranteed their perseverance in the state of being servants of God; therefore the suffering does not come until the sealing of the servants of God has occurred. It is significant, with respect to this purpose of the sealing, that the seal belongs to the *living* God, whereby it is not said that he is the true and actual, and hence not that it is only his seal which is valid,[12] but that he as the living also gives life.[13] Yet the conception of the glory, for which the sealed are preserved, is that they attain to eternal life in the sight of the living God.[14] — *ἔκραξεν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ*. The call with a strong voice is in general peculiar to heavenly beings; it does not always have a special purpose.[15] Beng. refers the loud cry of the angel to the fact that he wished to restrain the four angels who desired to make a beginning of the affliction; Hengstenb. finds therein the certainty of the command that has been given.

reserve its ardor" (ver. 16). But this supplementary fiction is in violation of the context, and ver. 16 has no analogy with the situation of ver. 1 sqq.

[1] Ew. i.

[2] Beng.

[3] Cf. C. a Lap., Hengstenb., Ebrard, Volkm.

[4] Beng.

[5] Cf. ver. 3: *σφραγ.* — *ἐπὶ τ. μετώπων αὐτ.*

[6] Eichh.

[7] Cf. xiv. 1, iii. 12.

[8] Hengstenb.

[9] *λαμβάνειν*; xiii. 16, xiv. 9, 11, xvi. 2, xix. 20, xx. 4.

[10] So Ewald, etc.

[11] Hengstenb.

[12] De Wette.

[13] Bengel, Ew., Hengstenb., Klief.

[14] Cf. ii. 7, 10, iii. 5, vii. 14 sqq., xxii. 1 sqq.

[15] Cf., e.g., vi. 1 with v. 2.

— The most probable idea is, that the call is to penetrate to the ends of the earth where the angels stand. — *οἷς — αὐτοῖς*, as iii. 8. — *ἐδόθη, κ.τ.λ.* Concerning the aor. in the sense of a plusquampf., cf. Winer, p. 258. On the conception of *ἐδόθη*, cf. vi. 4. The *ἀδικεῖν*, injuring,[1] would occur if the angels would let loose the winds which they still hold; the command *μὴ ἀδικήσατε, κ.τ.λ.*, still hinders this.[2] It is contrary to the context to regard the *ἀδικεῖν* as consisting rather in holding fast the winds, because, had the winds blown, they would have "cooled off,"[3] or "blown away,"[4] the approaching plagues; according to Herder, the restraining of the winds is to be regarded an *ἀδικεῖν*, as thereby "the sultriness of death" is occasioned before the irruption of the plagues. From the fact that in what follows, the letting loose of the devastating winds is not reported, the view that just this restraining of the winds is destructive[4] follows as little as the necessity of understanding the winds as a figurative designation of retributive visitations of all kinds.[5] For, that it is not devastating tempests, but other plagues of many kinds, which proceed from the opening of the seventh seal, has in a formal respect its foundation in the fact that the succeeding *seal*-vision cannot justly be regarded and be treated further as a matter from the simple visions occurring between the last two seals; but a difficulty actually arises only if, hindered by a mechanical literalism, it cannot be seen that the holy fantasy of the prophet sees in vii. 1 sqq. the storm impending, which afterwards, however, is not seen in its approach, because (viii. 1 sqq.), in place of the desolating winds, hail and fire, and other plagues, come forth. — It is noticeable that in ver. 2, the trees are not especially mentioned, as in vv. 1, 3, because it is self-evident that they belong to the earth;[6] there lies therein, however, a manifest hint that neither the earth, nor the sea, nor the trees, are to be understood figuratively. Hengstenb. asks, indeed, how the sea, if it be meant in the proper sense, could be injured by winds; he does not consider that the specification in which the trees, as objects most easily injured by storms, are especially made prominent with the simplicity of nature,[7] is meant only to serve[8] to make visible how the entire earth, from whose four ends the winds are to rage, will be injured. — *ἄχρι σφραγίσωμεν.* "*Until we shall have sealed.*" Cf. Winer, p. 279. The plur. indicates that the angel has associates, who need not be further mentioned.[9] With the whole train of thought of ver. 1 sqq., Hengstenb. conflicts when he advances the opinion that the four angels are to help in the sealing. The older interpreters, as Calov., refer the plur. to the Father and the Son, from both of whom the Holy Ghost (the seal) proceeds. [See Note LII., p. 255.] *τοὺς δούλους τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν.* "This noble designation pertains especially to saints from Israel. Gen. l. 17; Isa. lxi. 6."[10] Yet the reference in the connection is to Israel alone, although the expression in itself, because of the art., could include also the Gentiles. [Note LIII., p. 256.] To the angel here speaking, who is to seal, belong

[1] vi. 6.
[2] Cf. Alcas., C. a Lap., Vitr., Eichh., Ewald, De Wette, Hengstenb., Ebrard.
[3] Bengel. Cf. viii. 7 sqq.
[4] Rinck.
[5] Hengstenb.
[6] Ebrard.
[7] Cf. De Wette.
[8] Cf. v. 13.
[9] Bengel, Ew., De Wette, Rinck.
[10] Beng.

only the definite, more accurately designated servants of God, of ver. 4 sqq. The τ. θεοῦ ἡμῶν is significant; the angel himself, together with his associates, is, because of his relation to the same God, a fellow-servant of those for whose service he has been sent.[1] — ἐπὶ τῶν μετώπων αὐτῶν. The mark which the servants of the beast have received is, like the brand of slaves in ordinary life, impressed upon the right hand or forehead:[2] the servants of God bear the seal and name of the Lord only on the forehead. That this is the most visible place,[3] is a reason sufficient only with respect to those servants of the beast: with respect to the servants of God, however, it is found in the fact that the noblest part of the body bears the holy mark.

Vv. 4-8. καὶ ἤκουσα τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν ἐσφραγισμένων. The act of sealing is, therefore, to be considered as occurring between ver. 3 and ver. 4. That John does not behold this act itself, but only hears the number of the sealed, — probably from the other angel, vv. 2, 3,[4] — corresponds with the holy moderation which is peculiar to true prophecy; for as in the innumerable company, ver. 9 sqq., the sealing, in general, is such as cannot be represented,[5] so in reference to the one hundred and forty-four thousand out of Israel, it would be in a high degree unnatural if their sealing had occurred before the eyes of the prophet. In Ezek. ix. it is, likewise, not described how the mark was made upon the foreheads of the godly; but after the command for this is communicated (ver. 4), in ver. 11 it is said that it is accomplished. Yet it is not a happy fiction of John,[6] that he says that he has only *heard* the number of the sealed; but the apparently insignificant circumstance testifies to the truth of the vision, and the entirely ethical nature of divine revelation in general. Nor is it possible for that to be revealed by vision to the prophet which must conflict with his proper subjectivity. — The schematic number one hundred and forty-four thousand applies, as a product of the radical number twelve, especially to believers from the twelve tribes of Israel. — ἐκ πάσης φυλῆς υἱῶν Ἰσρ. "Out of *every* tribe." Cf. Winer, p. 105. The pregnant mode of expression shows that one hundred and forty-four thousand in all were sealed, and that the sealed were from every tribe. What follows (vv. 5-8) makes the declaration more specific, upon which it is to be noted: 1. That the number of twelve thousand, fixed for each of the twelve tribes, from the very fact that it is every time the same shows that it is schematic by expressing the idea that in the divine gifts of grace all have like share, but no one from any one right. It is just as when in Ezek. xlvii. 14, the Holy Land appears equally divided among all the tribes. 2. As to the representation of the tribes, neither the tribe of Levi dare be missing,[7] nor is the fixed number, twelve, exceeded. Yet it was impracticable to include Manasseh and Ephraim under the name of Joseph, because each of those two branches of the original tribe of Joseph stands by the side of the other tribes with sig-

[1] Cf. xix. 10, xxii. 9.
[2] xiii. 16, xiv. 9, xx. 4.
[3] Aret., Beng., Stern, etc.
[4] De Wette, Ebrard.
[5] See the general note on ch. vii.
[6] Züll.
[7] Beng., correctly: "Since the Levitical ceremonies have been abandoned, Levi again is found on an equal footing with his brethren. All are priests; all have access, not one through the other, but one with the other."

nificative independence of age.[1] If, also, John wanted, in general, to avoid the name of Ephraim, because of the untheocratic reminiscence connected therewith, he put instead thereof the accurately taken paternal name of Joseph, including also the fraternal tribe of Manasseh.[2] Yet the appearance of not thirteen, but only twelve tribes, is accomplished by the omission of the tribe of Dan.[3] Gomarus,[4] Hartwig, and Züll. have indeed put Δάν instead of Μανασσῆ, — an arbitrary decision, in no way justified by unimportant codd. (ix. 13), because they offer Δάν instead of Γάδ,[5] and this contradicts the express testimonies of Iren., Orig., Andr., etc. Of just as little force is the play upon the name Manasseh, according to which the root of the word (נָשָׁה, "he forgot") is regarded as indicating that here another name, viz., Dan, is regarded as forgotten, or properly not forgotten, but "embraced or incorporated in a secret way."[6] The intentional omission of the tribe of Dan is explained, especially by the Church Fathers, by the fact that from this tribe the Antichrist was to come,[7] which, however, John nowhere intimates. Others have recalled the idolatry of the Danites;[8] but the old sin of the tribe can be no foundation for excluding all its members from eternal life. The avoidance of the name of Ephraim, that had become "offensive,"[9] in no way favors this view, because the tribe named, of course, intentionally not as Ephraim, but Joseph, presents its twelve thousand like the rest. The simplest reason for not naming Dan lies rather in the fact that it had died out long already before the time of John;[10] even though the more definite declaration of Jewish tradition that only the family of Husim survived from the tribe of Dan,[11] may be nothing but a reminiscence of Gen. xlvi. 23. Already in 1 Chron. iv. sqq., the tribe of Dan is omitted, although it is not passed over in 1 Chron. ii. 1 sqq. Cf. also Deut. xxxiii., where the small tribes of Simeon and Issachar are lacking. — In the succession it is only by an artificial subtilty which often passes over into pure trifling, that a consequent intention and a mystical meaning can be found. Beda, e.g., explains, because of the secret meaning of the name: "After Judah, therefore, Reuben; i.e., after the beginnings of divine confession and praise, the performance of an action follows."[12] Besides, the opinion of Hengstenb.[13] is possible, that the sons of the wives and those of the bondwomen are intentionally commingled in order to indicate that in Christ no earthly distinction is valid. But Grot. also can say, from his standpoint, "No order is observed, because in Christ all are equal."[14] It is natural for Judah to have the precedence, because from that tribe the Lord comes."[15] Reuben follows afterwards, who as the firstborn could have stood before.[16] The succeeding names are introduced without further intention; only at the close

[1] Ewald, etc.
[2] Cf. Num. xiii. 11.
[3] Cf. especially Heinrichs, *Excursus* iii.: "Cur in recensu tribuum Israel, c. vii. 5–8, nulla tribus Danitica mentio fiat" (ii. 228 sqq.).
[4] In Wetst.
[5] Cf. also Matth.
[6] Beng., Eichh.
[7] Cf. Gen. xlix. 17. Beda, Andr., C. a Lap., Stern.
[8] Judg. xviii. Wetst., Vitr., Hengstenb.
[9] Hengstenb.
[10] Grot., Ew., De Wette, Ebrard, etc.
[11] Cf. Grot.
[12] "Reuben = videns filium; filii = opera."
[13] Cf. Vitr., etc.
[14] Cf. also C. a Lap., Calov., De Wette, etc.
[15] v. 5; Heb. vii. 14. Beda, Beng., Rinck, Ebrard, etc.
[16] Cf. also 1 Chron. v. 1.

stands Benjamin as the youngest, and finally, from an allusion to the O. T.,[1] in connection with Joseph.[2]

Ver. 9. *Μετὰ ταῦτα εἶδον, κ.τ.λ.* The entire vision, vv. 9–17, follows, of course, upon what precedes, but it is throughout, as to its significance, inseparable from what precedes; against De Wette, who calls the vision proleptical or ideal, because here John[3] "looks forward from the developments which he beholds in the earthly world, to their blessed fulfilment," — in connection with which nothing further is to be asked than how the saved enter heaven, whether through death, or otherwise. But even though the vision, as to its contents, be proleptical, nevertheless, wherever it occurs, its meaning and force must be determined by the connection of the entire Apoc.; and this corresponds to the parallelism in which the second vision of ch vii. stands to the first.[4] — *ὄχλον πολὺν, κ.τ.λ.* In contrast with the multitude out of Israel represented by a definite number (v. 4 sqq.), the great concourse from every people, and all tribes and tongues, appears here as innumerable. The contrast required by the text cannot be explained away by the fact, that, if the one hundred and forty-four thousand be identified with this great multitude, the innumerability becomes relative, with which then it is regarded as harmonizing that John, ver. 4, *heard* the number of the sealed, because they were innumerable *by him:*[5] this expedient, however, is not allowed by the words, ver. 9, *ὃν ἀριθ. αὐτ. οὐδεὶς ἠδ.*; cf. with reference to the *ὃν — αὐτον*, ver. 2. The remark of De Wette also, that ver. 4, by its numerical statement, presents the idea of election with the antithesis of reprobation, while ver. 9 refers only to the attaining of salvation without this antithesis, is inapplicable, because the idea of election lies alike in the text in both passages; since, just as the one hundred and forty-four thousand are *out of* Israel (*ἐκ πασ. φυλ. υἱ. Ἰσρ., ἐκ φυλ. Ἰουδ, κ.τ.λ.*), so the innumerable multitude are *out of* all nations (*ἐκ παντ. ἐθν.*). The essential distinction is in the fact that the horizon, which in ver. 4 comprised only Israel, now includes absolutely all nations and races, Gentiles and Jews, humanity in its totality. This is stated by the second formula with its four categories, which also comprises all sides in its enumeration.[6] [See Note LIV., p. 258.] *ἑστῶτες — περιβεβλημένους, κ.τ.λ.* There is no difficulty in the use of the plural with a collective;[7] but also the irregularity of using the nom. *ἑστῶτες*, and thus throwing the clause *ἑστ. — ἀρνίου* out of the construction, while the next words, *περιβεβλημένους, κ.τ.λ.*, recur to the original structure of the sentence (*εἶδον ὄχλον πολύν*), is not inadmissible in the idiom of the Apoc. The standing before the throne of God and of the Lamb[8] points to the eternal communion with God and the Lamb,[9] whose heavenly glory and blessed joy are also expressed by white robes,[10] and palm-branches

[1] Gen. xxxv. 24, xlvi. 20, 21; Deut. xxvii. 21; Num. i. 10, 11; 1 Chron. ii. 2.

[2] It is strange that in ℵ, not only Gad and Simeon are forgotten, but also Joseph and Benjamin are transposed.

[3] Cf. xi. 15 sqq., xiv. 1 sqq., 13, xv. 2 sqq.

[4] See general remarks on ch. vii.

[5] Hengstenb.

[6] Cf. v. 9.

[7] Winer, p. 480.

[8] Cf. ver. 15, xxii. 3.

[9] Grot., who refers this, in general, to the great number of Christians in Syria, remarks on *ἑστῶτες, κ.τ.λ.*: "i.e., having a mind not sunk to earth, but raised to heaven."

[10] Cf. vi. 11.

in the hands of those who have finished their course. There is no foundation for the inference from the φοίνικες of a heavenly feast of tabernacles as the festival of the eternal harvest-home;[1] but when, also, in ver. 15 (σκηνώσει ἐπ' αὐτούς), a reference is found to the dwelling in tabernacles, and, in connection with ver. 17 (ἐπὶ ζωῆς πηγὰς ὑδάτων), to the fact that[2] during the feast of tabernacles, a priest daily drew water from the wells of Siloah in order to sprinkle it beside the altar, something entirely foreign is introduced.[3] But on the other side, also, the reference to the palm-branches, which the victors in the Grecian games bore with their palm-garlands,[4] is excessively specific.[5] It is entirely sufficient, without any more special reference, to regard the palm-branches as a sign of festal joy.[6] — κ. κράζουσι φωνῇ μεγαλῇ. The strength of the cry, besides being peculiar to the heavenly beings,[7] corresponds to the impulse of their joy and gratitude.[8] — ἡ σωτηρία, κ.τ.λ. They sing praises as those who have become complete participants of salvation; and this they ascribe to their God, who sits upon the throne, as the ultimate author, and the Lamb as the mediator. The σωτηρία is not victory in general,[9] but the entire sum of the salvation which the blessed now perfectly possess, since they have been removed from all want, temptation, sin, and death, and have come into the presence of their God.[10] Improperly, Grot. explains ἡ σωτηρία metonymically, viz., "thanks for the salvation received." The thanksgiving, however, occurs from the fact that the σεσωμένοι ascribe the σωτηρία given them, to their God as σωτήρ.

Vv. 11, 12. All the angels,[11] in response, continue the ascription of praise, ver. 10. — εἱστήκεισαν — καὶ ἔπεσαν, κ.τ.λ. They stood already ("had stationed themselves") during the scene described in vv. 9, 10; now they fall down.[12] — Ἀμήν. The angels, first of all, conclude man's song of praise, ver. 10,[13] in order then, in their own way, to carry it farther: ἡ εὐλογία, κ.τ.λ. This doxology is formally distinguished from that in v. 12 by the fact that in this passage every particular item appears distinctly marked by the article attached as being in complete independence. Beng. remarks, arbitrarily, that the sevenfold ascription of praise has in view the seven trumpets, and therefore in the trumpet of the first angel, εὐλογία, and in that of the second angel, δόξα, prevails, etc. With equal arbitrariness, Hengstenb.: the εὐλογία, which concludes v. 12, here precedes as a sign that the present ascription of praise is connected with the former, — but what a distance between v. 12 and vii. 12! The particular explanation of Grot. on ver. 11: "For both the apostles who were at Jerusalem, and the elders, had gone forth together," in connection with his reference of ver. 9 sqq. to the multitude of Christians in Syria, is to be understood only when his observations on iv. 4, 6 sqq., are recalled.

[1] Cf. Vitr., Eichh., Heinr., Hengstenb., Böhmer.

[2] Cf. Winer, *Rwb.*, ii. 9.

[3] Against Vitr., Hengstenb., etc.

[4] Pausanias, *Arcad.*, 48: οἱ δὲ ἀγῶνες φοίνικος ἔχουσιν οἱ πολλοὶ στέφανον· εἰς δὲ τὴν δεξίαν ἐστὶ καὶ πανταχοῦ τῷ νικῶντι ἐστι θέμενος φοῖνιξ.; in Wetst.

[5] Against Ew., etc.

[6] Cf. John xii. 13; 1 Macc. xiii. 51.

[7] Cf. ver. 2.

[8] Cf. C. a Lap.

[9] Eichh.

[10] Cf. vv. 9, 15, xxi. 4.

[11] Cf. v. 11, where, in a similar way, an innumerable multitude appears.

[12] Cf. v. 14, xi. 16.

[13] C. a Lap., Beng., Heinr., Ew., Hengstenb.

Vv. 13–17. The second half of the vision contains an express interpretation of the first half, ver. 9 sqq. — That it is one of the elders, who gives this interpretation,[1] corresponds with the idea of these elders as the representatives of the Church,[2] whose innumerable multitude appears here in glory.[3] — *ἀπεκρίθη* designates, like עָנָה,[4] the speech uttered when an occasion is given,[5] which, however, cannot be limited to a definite question. Here the *ἀποκρίνεσθαι* may be referred[6] to the (unexpressed) desire of John to learn something further concerning the multitude beheld in ver. 9; but even without accepting any such unexpressed question of John, the simple reference of the fact of the vision, ver. 9 sqq., as the occasion for the declaration of the elders, is sufficient. The form of a dialogue,[7] with its dramatic vividness, serves to emphasize the point under consideration; for, by asking what he intends to explain,[8] the elder brings John to the answer which comprises the acknowledgment of his own ignorance, and the expression of the wish for an explanation. Thus, then the explanation, awaited with expectancy, follows in ver. 14 sqq. — *τίνες εἰσὶν καὶ πόθεν ἦλθον.* The elder presents the two points concerning which one unacquainted would naturally ask first.[9] Both questions also have their answer in ver. 14, of course not in an external sense as though they had to do with names, station, country, etc., but so that the inner nature of the appearance is explained. — The address *κύριε μου*, which everywhere expresses real homage, — even where the *μου*, which makes the reference still more earnest, is lacking,[10] — has in John's mouth complete justification, because he stands before a heavenly being, whose superiority he acknowledges in the matter immediately under consideration by the *σὺ οἶδας.* By this John does not say, "I, indeed, know it too, but you know it better,"[11] but, "I do not know it, yet it may be heard from you, as you know it."[12] — *οἱ ἐρχόμενοι.* Incorrectly, Ew. i.: "who have just come hither;' Ebrard, etc., "those having come." The *present* is to be retained,[13] as it alone corresponds to the idea of the entire vision;[14] for it is not individuals, as possibly martyrs,[15] who are introduced, but to the seer there is given in anticipation a view of *all* faithful believers, as they are thus shown to him as those who, after the great tribulation of the last day shall be finished, shall stand before the throne of God and of the Lamb, ver. 9 sqq. The explanation of the elder (in which the present *ἐρχόμενοι*, the aor. *ἔπλυναν*, *ἐλεύκαναν* (ver. 14), again the present *εἰσὶν*, *λατρεύουσιν*, and, finally, the future *σκηνώσει* — *ἐξαλείψει* (vv. 15–17), must, in like manner, be observed) is intelligible in its form of expression only by regarding the reality as not yet coinciding with

[1] Cf. v. 4.
[2] Cf. iv. 4.
[3] Cf. Ebrard.
[4] Cant. ii. 10. Ew.
[5] Matt. xi. 25. Cf., on this, Meyer.
[6] Beng., Hengstenb.
[7] De Wette. Cf. Jer. i. 11 sqq.; Zech. iv. 1 sqq.
[8] "He asks in order to teach." Beda, C. a Lap., Aret., etc.
[9] Cf. Jon. i. 8. Virg., *Aen.*, viii. 14: "Qui genus? unde domo?" More examples of the kind in Wetst.
[10] Zech. i. 9, iv. 4, 5, 13; Gen. xxiii. 6, 11, xxxi. 35; Num. xii. 11; John xii. 21, xx. 15.
[11] Ebrard.
[12] Beng., Ew., De Wette, Hengstenb.
[13] Beng., Züll., De Wette, Hengstenb.; also Ew. ii.
[14] Cf. the preliminary remarks on ch. vii.
[15] Cf. the *ἐκ τ. θλίψ. τ. μεγ.* and the *ἔπλυναν*, *κ.τ.λ.*

what has been beheld. The vision displays that host as they *are* already before God's throne, and *are serving* him (*εἰσὶν, λατρεύουσιν*, ver. 15, pres.); they are those who (in their earthly life) *have washed* (*ἔπλυναν, ἐλεύκαναν*, ver. 14, aor.) their robes in the blood of the Lamb. From the same standpoint, the pres. *ἐρχόμενοι* yields the idea, that they come before the eyes of the gazing prophet, and assemble before the throne of God. For it appears more suitable to one contemplating the standpoint of the vision in all the other points up to ver. 15*a* (*ἐν τ. ν. αὐτ.*), to hold fast, also, to the pres. *ἐρχόμενοι*, than[1] to regard this *ἐρχόμενοι* in the sense of a future, and to find the allusion in the fact that that multitude was actually still upon earth, and is only still to come. Particularly opposed to this is the combination with the aor. *κ. ἔπλυναν*. But from ver. 15*b* (*καὶ ὁ καθήμ., κ.τ.λ.*), the elder speaks not from the standpoint of the vision, but of reality. To that entire multitude, which is already presented to John in the vision as in final glory, there yet belongs first, since they are, in reality, still upon earth, the great hope of which the elder speaks: *ὁ καθ. ἐπὶ τ. θρ. σκηνώσει ἐπ' αὐτ., οὐ πεινάσουσιν, κ.τ.λ.* It is throughout sufficient that the explanatory address maintains in the beginning the standpoint of the vision, and that it is not until the close that the proper situation of affairs is opened. — *ἐκ τῆς θλίψεως τῆς μεγάλης*. Not only because of the definite article, and the discriminating predicate *τ. μεγάλης*, but also because of the reference of the entire vision from ver. 9, it is impossible to understand "the great tribulation" very generally "of all trouble and labor on earth:"[2] on the contrary, the eschatological reference is necessary whereby the *θλῖψις*, announced by the Lord in Matt. xxiv. 21, and also prophesied by John, which is to be expected after vi. 17, and therefore in the seventh seal, the immediate preparatory signs of which, also, are described already in vi. 12-17, is meant.[3] The entire vision (ver 9 sqq.) thus places before the eyes the fact, that, like the sealed of Israel (ver. 1 sqq.), the innumerable multitude of all believers out of all nations shall nevertheless remain faithful in that great tribulation, and therefore shall attain to heavenly glory. — *καὶ ἔπλυναν — ἀρνίου*. Concerning the relation expressed by the aor., see on *οἱ ἐρχόμενοι*. On the subject itself, Beda remarks, "He does not speak of the martyrs alone: they are washed in their own blood." Thus he has already[4] correctly recognized the idea at once obvious, which elsewhere is marked by the expression *τ. ἀρνίου*,[5] that the whiteness of the robes has been produced by the (atoning and redeeming) blood of Christ as the Lamb of God.[6] But the idea recognized, in general, by Beda, of the cleansing power of martyrdom, has been introduced into the text not only by expositors like N. de Lyra, who regards the blood of the Lamb as the blood of martyrs, "because it is the blood of his members," but even by Ew. i., manifestly because of his erroneous reference of ver. 9 sqq. to martyrs, as he remarks, "by the blood of Christ, i.e., the death which they endured because of Christ's doctrine, and having followed in this the example of Christ," etc. It is, in other respects, contrary to the nature of the

[1] Züll., Hengstenb.
[2] Gen. v. 20, iii. 16 sqq. Beng.
[3] Cf. Ewald, De Wette, Hengstenb., Ebrard.
[4] Cf. Beng., De Wette, Hengstenb., Ebrard, Bleek; also Ew. ii.
[5] Cf. v. 6.
[6] Cf. i. 5; Eph. v. 25 sqq.; 1 John i. 7.

figures, when Hengstenb. tries to distinguish the *washing* from the *making white*, and refers the former to the forgiveness of sins, and the latter to sanctification; such a washing, however, is designated whereby the robes are made white. The delicate feature of correct ethics is also here to be noted, which lies in the fact that they who (in their earthly life) have washed their garments white in the blood of the Lamb appear in the future life attired in white clothing.[1] What follows also ver. 15, in its connection with *διὰ τοῦτο*, depends upon the fundamental view which has been explained: those hosts could not stand before God's throne, beneath the protection of his shadow, if, through the temptation of the great tribulation, they had not carried unsoiled the garments which had been made white in the blood of the Lamb. — Concerning the tenses, the present (*εἰσὶν*, *λατρεύουσιν*, ver. 15*a*) and the future (*σκηνώσει*, *κ.τ.λ.*, ver. 15*b*–17), see on *οἱ ἐρχόμενοι* (ver. 14). To refer the entire discourse (vv. 15–17) to earthly circumstances,[2] is so manifestly contrary to the tenor of the words, that the entire conception of ch. vii., which introduces such absurdities, contradicts itself. — *εἰσιν ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου τ. θ.* Already, the fact that they are there is blessedness. Cf. iv. 4, xxi. 3, xxii. 4; John xvii. 24; 1 John iii. 2; Phil. i. 23; 1 Cor. xiii. 12. *καὶ λατρεύουσιν*, *κ.τ.λ.* Cf. iv. 8 sqq., v. 8 sqq., xxii. 3. It is the glory of the priestly service in heaven; hence, *ἐν τῷ ναῷ αὐτοῦ*.[3] — *ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός*. "Speaking after our custom, eternity is nevertheless meant."[4] — *καὶ ὁ καθήμενος — σκηνώσει ἐπ' αὐτούς*. In accord with Lev. xxvi. 11, Isa. iv. 5, Ezek. xxxvii. 27,[5] here[6] the eternal, immediate, personal presence of God enthroned in his glory, and the holiness and blessedness of believers perfected therein, are described, viz., the shechinah of God over them, but no more, as in an earthly covering, by pillars of smoke and fire, but in its heavenly immediateness, so that the *σκηνοῦν* of the enthroned One harmonizes with the *εἶναι ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου τ. θ.* of the blessed. The further description also of heavenly freedom from pain (ver. 16), and eternal refreshment and consolation (ver. 17; cf. xxi. 4), is given with the old prophetic features.[7] — *πᾶν καῦμα*, after the special *ὁ ἥλιος*, is general; no kind of heat, whatever it may be, e.g., that of scorching wind.[8] — *ὅτι τὸ ἀρνίον*, *κ.τ.λ.* Isa. lxix. 10, declares the reason: "for[9] *he that hath mercy on them* shall lead them,[10] even by the springs of water shall he guide them."[11] By writing instead of this,[12] *τὸ ἀρνίον*, *κ.τ.λ.*, John designates the mediatorship of Christ, the Lamb, through whose blood especially,[13] believers have come where they now stand, and who also feeds his own people there,[14] and leads them unto living fountains of waters. An allusion to the position of the Lamb as mediator lies, besides, in the designation *τὸ ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ θρόνου*. This formula is impossible with the entirely

[1] Cf. iii. 4, xix. 8.

[2] Grot., on ver. 15: "Here at Pella, God kept them safe from all the very great evils which await the contumacious Jews;" on ver. 16, "They shall have whence they may live."

[3] Cf. the *ἱερεῖς* (i. 6, v. 10), which pertains already to the earthly life of believers.

[4] Beda.

[5] De Wette, Hengstenb., etc.

[6] Cf. xxi. 3.

[7] Cf. Isa. xlix. 10, xxv. 8.

[8] De Wette.

[9] Incorrectly, LXX.: *ἀλλά*.

[10] Incorrectly, LXX.: *παρακαλέσει*.

[11] Inaccurately, LXX.: *καὶ διὰ πηγῶν ὑδάτων ἄξει αὐτούς*.

[12] Cf. De Wette, Hengstenb., Ebrard.

[13] Cf. v. 9.

[14] Cf. xiv. 1 sqq.

synonymous *ἐν μεσῷ τοῦ θρόνου*, vv. 5, 6, as De Wette wishes, because there the position of the Lamb is not "in the midst of the throne," but "in the midst of the throne and of the four beasts, and in the midst of the elders;[1] but here the position of the Lamb is described entirely apart from the circle of the four beasts and the elders, and alone with reference to the throne. Only the present statement dare not stand in opposition to v. 6. Ewald's explanation: "towards the midst of the throne, i e., near the throne, placed by the Divine throne," is too vague, and ignores the peculiar significance of the *ἀνὰ μέσον*; although the translation, "towards the midst of the throne," is perfectly correct.[2] The difficulty of the idea lies in the fact that, while in other places the *ἀνὰ μέσον* refers[3] to a mass,[4] or at least to two parts, in whose midst something is arranged,[5] here *ἀνὰ μέσον* is attached to the single conception *τοῦ θρόνου*, so that the simple "between," which necessarily corresponds with the *ἐν μέσῳ*, v. 6, is here entirely inadmissible. But the solution lies in the way indicated by Ewald: the Lamb is so placed as to be turned towards the midst of the throne; it therefore stands directly before the throne,[6] — a statement perfectly harmonizing with the description of v. 6. If, however, the Lamb be beheld directly before the throne of God, or in the midst of the circle of representatives of believers who surround God's throne, it always has the same position between Him who sits on the throne, and the four beings and twenty-four elders who stand around; i.e., the form of the Lamb in itself, as well as this position, designates Christ as the atoning mediator. Hence it is just as little liable to exception, that there is ascribed here to the Lamb both a *ποιμαίνειν* and a *ὁδηγεῖν*,[7] as comprising the Lamb's entire activity.[8] — *ἐπὶ ζωῆς πηγὰς ὑδάτων*. The emphatic prefixing of *ζωῆς* is precisely like that of *σαρκός*, 1 Pet. iii. 21.[9] On the subject itself, cf. xxii. 1. — *καὶ ἐξαλείψει, κ.τ.λ.* Cf. xxi. 4; Isa. xxv. 8. It is not without many tears that they come out of great tribulation (ver. 14); but when they have overcome, God himself shall dry their tears, and change their weeping into joy.[10] [See Note LV., p. 258.]

Notes by the American Editor.

LII. Ver. 3. *σφραγισώμεν.*

Beck: "Sealing, in general, serves partly for authentication or confirmation, partly for assurance. Here it is accomplished by means of the seal of the living God, the Divine, royal seal (ver. 2). *Divine* sealing designates a real act, a covenant act, whereby the one who receives it is acknowledged and authenticated as belonging to God by an actual mark of discrimination (Rom. iv. 11). In the N. T. sense, the Holy Spirit is the Divine seal of the covenant, and the

[1] See on the passage.

[2] Against Hengstenb., who defends the superficial translation "between, in the midst."

[3] Exod. xi. 7; Ezek. xxii. 16; 1 Kings v. 12; Judg. xv. 4; LXX.; also 1 Cor. vi. 5. Cf., on this, Meyer.

[4] Matt. xiii. 25; Mark vii. 31; Isa. lvii. 5.

[5] Cf. Winer, p. 372.

[6] Ew. ii.: "*an der Mitte des Stuhles.*"

[7] It is, nevertheless, the proper person Christ who is understood as the Shepherd of his people. Cf. Ps. xxiii. 1; 1 Pet. ii. 12; John x. 12.

[8] 5:7 sq.

[9] Beng.

[10] Cf. Ps. cxxvi. 5 sq.

sealing occurs by the communication of the Holy Spirit (2 Cor. i. 22; Eph. i. 13, iv. 30). The idea of the living God is concentrated especially in the quickening Spirit of the new covenant. By the communication of this Spirit, man is not merely assured of, or promised, something new, but something real is given him. There is then in man a new spirit entirely different from what he previously had; a spirit such as was manifested in Christ, and which thus animates him with an entirely different inner life from what he had before, a life actually rooted and nourished in Christ and God. A result of this communication of the spirit is that they who receive it are elect (1 Thess. i. 4 sq.; 2 Thess. ii. 13). At the same time, they are armed by the Spirit, and by his power assured against a fall and wandering astray (Rev. iii. 10; 2 Tim. i. 7, 12, 14; 1 Pet. i. 5; 1 John iv. 4, v. 18). The reference to error and a fall dare not be here excluded, as, at the crisis of the world, the wisdom, patience, and fidelity of believers will, in various ways, be expressly put to the test (xiii. 8–10, xiv. 12). But, as in ch. vii. 3, the sealing is presented in direct contrast with the harm inflicted upon the world, there is in this sealing also a security, by God's preservation, against the plagues from God, impending over the world. Cf., as analogies, Exod. xii. 7, 13; Ezek. ix. 4. But this does not prevent those sealed against the Divine judgments and temptations, from having still to suffer many troubles from men, of whom the greater part, even during the Divine judgment, do not come to repentance, but rather are guilty of all sorts of manifestations of godlessness. Cf. the epistles, chs. ii. and iii.; also vi. 11, xiii. 10, 15; Matt. xxiv. 9. In the time of expectation, therefore (vi. 11), in the nearness of God's judgments, there occurs a sealing, i.e., an especial spiritual strengthening and providential assurance of those elected as belonging to the people of God. According to the character of the book, the sealing is typified before the sight of John; hence an angel appears with a golden seal in his hand, although the Divine sealing is the work of the Spirit of God, and not of an angel. The sealing further occurs by an impression on the forehead, and thus is externally imparted to the sealed. If we compare ch. xiv. 1, where the same number, one hundred and forty-four thousand, recurs, only in another connection, it is the name of the Father of Jesus Christ that is written or impressed as a mark upon the forehead. The sealing itself is not there mentioned, since this had preceded the persecution; there the one hundred and forty-four thousand have experienced both sealing and persecution. The seal contains the name of the owner; after they have been sealed on the forehead with God's seal, they continue to carry there God's name. Cf. also iii. 12, xxii. 4. Therefore by the seal of God on the forehead is designated the Divine disposition externally expressing itself in their personal conduct, and thereby also giving assurance externally that marks them as belonging to God. The antithesis to this mark of God is the mark of the beast on the forehead (xiii. 16)." Gebhardt: "A symbol of the Divine assurance that his servants should not be smitten by the greater plagues which were yet to come."

LIII. Ver. 4. *τοὺς δούλους τοῦ θεοῦ.*

Gebhardt emphatically dissents from the limitation of the one hundred and forty-four thousand to converted Israelites: "Neither the Jews in contrast with the Gentiles, nor the Christian Jews in distinction from the Christian Gentiles, but Christians, the true Israelites, whether Jews or Gentiles. The twelve tribes of the children of Israel are therefore identical with the people of God; only the

latter are described in O. T. style, or typically, and as a living great organism." "Where the purpose is to confirm Christians in their confidence in God, or to impress on their mind their high dignity, they are represented as the true Israel, as the numbered or chosen one hundred and forty-four thousand." So Philippi (*Kirch. Glaubenslehre*, iv. iii. 251): "The one hundred and forty-four thousand sealed out of all the tribes of the children of Israel are not only Christians among the Jews, upon which see Calov., Ewald, De Wette, Hengstenb., Klief., etc.; but rather the entire congregation of believers is meant, the true spiritual Israel, who have been preserved from all the plagues to be inflicted on the world." Beck also argues against the view advocated by our author, but regards those sealed as elect persons among believers: "The *υἱοὶ Ἰσραήλ* here mentioned are ancient Israel as little as Jerusalem in the Apocalypse is ancient Jerusalem, or as little as, in general, the temple, altar, candlesticks, Balaam, Jezebel, Jews, etc., above, designate the ancient historical objects and persons; but the latter are only the types of that which corresponds in the Christian congregation. So the name Israelites here is likewise typical. The twelve tribes of the children of Israel, from whom the choice is made, have, in the Apocalypse, their metropolis in the New Jerusalem, which, according to xxi. 12, 14, has the names of the twelve tribes of Israel on its doors, and is built upon the foundation of the twelve apostles. The name of this new Jerusalem, as the N. T. city of God, is, according to iii. 12, stamped, together with the name of the N. T. God (my God, i.e., Jesus Christ), and, therefore, with the seal of God here mentioned with respect to the children of Israel, upon those who, by fidelity to the word of Jesus Christ, have proved conquerors in the time of trial. Thus it is also expressly said of the one hundred and forty-four thousand designated in xiv. 3, that they were 'purchased from the *earth*,' or (ver. 4) 'from among men,' from humanity, and, therefore, not merely from the Jewish nation; cf. v. 9. In the Apocalypse, the entire development of the kingdom is stated universally. It has thus, also, nothing whatever to do with a particularistic national sphere, or with the history of a particular people, but with the universal national sphere, with the universal judgment and universal salvation, and, therefore, with a universal and not a partial, holy nation; cf. x. 11. But this conception is conformable also to the N. T. fundamental view. According to this, there is awarded to ancient Israel, indeed, the first participation in universal grace (Rom. i. 16, xi. 25–32), but no such particular preference as the sealing before the plagues, so that, therefore, all Gentile Christians must be subject thereto. The national distinction between Jew and Gentile, the distinction of the flesh, is removed in the fellowship of the new covenant (John x. 16, xi. 52). What unites them as one new people of God is the unity of faith and life on the basis of the new, spiritual type of humanity formed in Jesus Christ. Cf. Acts xv. 7–9; Rom. ii. 28. Cf. ver. 29 with ver. 26; Eph. ii. 13–15, 18, iii. 3–6; 1 Cor. xii. 13; Gal. iii. 26–28; Col. iii. 11. Since the Christian community, formed of both nationalities, is the true bearer of the Divine covenant, the name of Israel and its twelve tribes is, accordingly, transferred to the Christian Church. Only in its unity and organization of spirit, the typical Israel finds its full expression, its fulfilment, as it formerly presented only a union and organization of people of God which was of the flesh (Rom. ix. 6–8). Cf. Gal. iv. 28; Rom. ix. 24 sqq., x. 11–13: Gal. iii. 7, iv. 26, vi. 15 sq. Cf. Phil. iii. 3; 1 Pet. i. 1, with ii. 9; Matt. xix. 28 with viii. 11 sq. and xxviii. 19; Rev. xviii. 4; and, finally, xxi. 12, 14, the climax of the entire view. . . . The number of the sealed in the Apoc. comprises, therefore, neither merely converted Jews (whether of the first or the last times),

nor all Christendom, or the entire number of believers, but (*ἐκ πάσης φυλῆς*) a selection from all tribes or sections of believers without distinction of Jewish or heathen origin. They are the approved spiritual Christians, the *τέλειοι* (Phil. iii. 13 sqq.); and their sealing occurs by their receiving the new seal of the covenant, the Holy Spirit of the Father and the Son in special power and fulness, so that he appears in a visible mark, characterizing their entire conduct, and secures them against the trials pertaining to the empire of the world, especially on the part of a spurious Christianity (cf. Matt. xxiv. 21–25; 1 John ii. 18, 20, 27), and against the judgments of God proceeding through the world."

LIV. Ver. 9. *ὄχλος πολύς.*

"Where the mercy and love of God are praised, Christians are represented as an innumerable multitude" (De Wette, Gebhardt). Beck, however, urges the distinction from those mentioned in vv. 3–8: "This appearance forms manifestly a contrast with what precedes. For: 1. The definite one hundred and forty-four thousand is opposed by the innumerable multitude. 2. *ἐκ παντὸς ἔθνους* is contrasted with *ἐκ πάσης φυλῆς υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ*. 3. Ver. 14. The *οἱ ερχόμενοι ἐκ τῆς θλίψεως τῆς μεγάλης* must have passed through the great tribulation in contrast with the elect secured therefrom already before its beginning (ver. 2 sqq.). 4. Finally, there is a contrast in the placing of the great multitude in heaven (ver. 9, *ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου*), while the theatre in the preceding ver. 3 is the earth. Here, then, those appear who have passed through the visitation of judgment, and suffered, although they have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb; i.e., they have availed themselves of the cleansing efficacy offered in Christ (ver. 14), for participation in which they were not aroused until by persecution. Cf. 1 Cor. iii. 12–15. Of the death of martyrs, which has been conjectured, nothing is here said. By the side, therefore, of the sealed first-fruits, appear those who have not been purified until by the tribulation. From them proceeds an innumerable multitude of triumphing conquerors. . . . To the apostolic, Christian, germinal Church, to the elect from the Divine-covenant people, there is added the elect from all humanity. Since, however (ver. 3 sqq.), the people of God itself is distinguished according to tribes, and, from these tribes, the sealed are taken only as a selection, and thus, also, among the tribes (ver. 9) are comprised those who belong to the people of God, i.e., Jews and Christians, in like manner, the *πᾶν ἔθνος* includes the entire heathen world. Therefore, after the great period of tribulation (Matt. xxiv. 21–29), and through it, a collection of the saved still continues, from all humanity, without distinction of religion, whether heathen, or Jewish, or Christian (cf. Rom. ii. 7–10), as well as without distinction of political relations (*λαῶν*) and languages (*γλωσσῶν*). For, since there is no section of the human world that does not furnish its contingent to those saved from the great tribulation, an innumerable multitude is formed, although relatively the elect are few (Matt. xx. 16)."

LV. Vv. 14–17.

Gebhardt: "The heavenly promises add nothing new to those already available for the earthly Christian life. It is evident that the promise of deliverance from tribulation, rest from labor, cessation from suffering, as well as perpetual joy after trial overcome, belong only to heaven. But, otherwise,

the contents of future blessedness are distinguished from those in the promises only in particular symbolic features, and they are still, in nature, the same. The Christian has this blessedness at the moment of his becoming a Christian; but what he possesses and does and is here, in conflict and growth, amidst the discrepancy of his real nature with its manifestation in his life, and still more with the conduct of the world, he possesses and does and is there, in rest and realization."

CHAPTER VIII.

Ver. 1. Instead of *ὅτε* (ℵ), which comes from vi. 1, 3, etc., read *ὅταν* (A, C, Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]). — Ver. 3. *ἵνα δώσει.* So, properly, Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.], in accord with A, C, ℵ. Emendations are *δώσῃ* (Elz., Beng., Griesb., Matth.) and *δῷ* (6, 9, al., in Wetst.). — Ver. 7. The words *καὶ τὸ τρίτον τῆς γῆς κατεκάη*, which are lacking in the Elz. text, are restored by Beng., Griesb., and modern editors, upon the authority of decisive witnesses. — Ver. 9. *διεφθάρησαν.* So A, ℵ, 10, 12, al., Andr., ed. Compl. Plant., Genev., Beng., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]. The *διεφθάρη* (Elz.) is an emendation after the analogy of ver. 7. — Ver. 11. *ἐγένετο.* So A, ℵ, 2, 4, 6, al., Beng., Matth., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]. Incorrectly, Elz.: *γίνεται.* — Ver. 13. *ἀετοῦ.* So, already, Beng., Griesb. The modification *ἀγγέλου* (Elz.) has no critical value whatever. Nevertheless, many expositors, Vitr., L. Twells in Wolf, etc., have advocated *ἀγγέλου* on the same ground, from which has proceeded not only this alteration, but also the single variation *ἀγγέλου ὡς ἀετοῦ* (Wetst.); viz., because the function ascribed to the eagle seems better adapted to an angel. (Cf. xiv. 6.) Heinrichs, who does not doubt the correctness of the reading *ἑνὸς ἀετοῦ*, would have an *ὡς* supplied before *ἀετοῦ*, and then explain: "An angel flying through the heaven with the swiftness of an eagle." ℵ has *αἐτοῦ* without *ἑνὸς*.

From the seventh seal, now opened, there proceeds, not as from each of the first six, a single vision, but a series of visions, which not only stand like those seals in a progressive connection with one another, but also, even at the end, extend again into a new series of visions.[1] After the opening of the seventh seal, silence for half an hour intervenes in heaven, during which seven angels appear who receive trumpets; and since then, after a certain action performed by another angel (ver. 3 sqq.), those seven angels, one after another, sound on their trumpets, scenes are presented to the gazing prophet, which, according to the analogy of the visions proceeding from the opened seals, describe what is to happen.[2] Nothing is here to be said concerning the reading of the book-roll now opened.[3]

Ver. 1. *ὅταν.* In the sense of *ὅτε*,[4] as is not unusual among the Byzantines.[5] — *σιγὴ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ὡς ἡμίωρον.* The silence in heaven, lasting about[6] a half-hour, begins at the place where the songs of praise still resound, vii. 10 sqq. The voice also of the elder who speaks immediately before the opening of the seventh seal is silent. When the Lamb took the book with the seven seals, the music of the harp and the song of praise resounded in

[1] xi. 15 sqq.
[2] Cf. iv. 1.
[3] Ew. ii.
[4] See Critical Notes.
[5] Winer, p. 290.
[6] ὡς; cf. John i. 40, vi. 19, xi. 18; Mark v. 13; Luke viii. 42.

heaven, v. 8 sqq.; also at the opening of the first six seals, it was in many ways audible;[1] but when the last seal is opened, a profound silence ensues. The reason for this is the anxious expectation of the inhabitants of heaven, who not only after the precedency of the sixth seal must now expect the final decisive catastrophe, but, also, can infer the proximity of that catastrophe from the appearing of the seven angels, and their being furnished with trumpets. The σιγὴ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ is thus a "silent expectation and contemplation of the seven trumpets,"[2] and, as an expression of "the stupor of the heavenly beings," belongs to "the adornment and fitness of the dramatic scene."[3] Thus, essentially, Andr., Areth., Par., Vieg., Rib., Aret., Calov., Beng., Ew., De Wette, Stern, Ebrard, all of whom are one on the main point,[4] that the σιγή does *not* compose the entire contents of the seventh seal, but that rather from this last seal the entire series of trumpet-visions is developed. If this is denied, as by Vitr., and recently by Hengstenb., not only is the organic connection of the visions as a whole rent, — since "the group of the seven trumpets" appears immediately beside "the group of the seven seals,"[5] but results follow with respect to the exposition as a whole, and in its details, that are entirely inadmissible. Hengstenb. interprets the σιγὴ ἐν τ. οὐρ., as the silencing of the enemies of Christ and his Church, which corresponds with their mourning,[6] and is regarded as caused by the punishments of the preceding six seals. And, besides, the ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, which alone is strong enough to render this mode of statement impossible, is explained away by the remark: "Heaven here comes into consideration only as a theatre (iv. 1, xii. 1). In reality the silence belongs to the earth"! — Vitr. seeks, in a better way, to meet the demands of the text. He refutes, first, the view according to which it is thought that in vv. 1–6 the entire contents of the seventh seal are described,[7] by the excellent remark that already, in ver. 2, the angels of the trumpets enter, and that vv. 2–6 contain in general a certain preparation for ver. 7 sqq. But while Vitr. thus properly hesitates to sunder ver. 2 sqq. from ver. 7 sqq., he separates ver. 1 from ver. 2 sqq. by finding in ver. 1 the contents of the seventh seal, i.e., the complete conclusion of the series of seal-visions, according to their prophetic significance extending until the end of the world, which, in their way, comprise the entire breadth of Apocalyptic prophecy; for from this it necessarily follows that the prophecy begins again with the first trumpet-vision, which runs parallel to the first seal-vision, etc. The σιγὴ ἐν τ. οὐρ. designates, according to Vitr., "the condition of the most recent period of the Church, in which the Church in the possession of peace, tranquillity, and an abundance of all spiritual blessings, celebrates a triumph over its enemies." This σιγή, therefore, actually lasts a long time, although it appears to John a half-hour,[8] — as Lange with entire consistency says, one thousand years.[9]

[1] vi. 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 12.

[2] C. a Lap. [3] Eichh.

[4] Cf. also Grot., Wetst., Herder, etc., who in other respects deny the reference of the whole.

[5] Hengstenb.

[6] Matt. xxiv. 30.

[7] Braun, *Select. Sacr.*, ii. cc. 1.

[8] Cf. Aret., Bengel; the latter of whom reckoned the ἡμίωρον as about four ordinary days.

[9] Cf. also Beda, Hofm., etc.

The connection with the trumpet-visions lies in the fact that here "the Spirit explains in what way and by what steps God led the Church into that state," viz., as those trumpet-visions describe: "Evils intended for the punishment of the Roman Empire, the enemy of the Church of Christ, to be terminated in the total destruction of the same empire." There are two main points characteristic of this mode of conception, which is best advocated by Vitr., in which, however, the distortion is evident; viz., the explanation of the σιγὴ ἐν τ. οὐρ., and the statement of the connection with the trumpet-visions. If it is assumed that the seventh seal brings nothing else than that σιγὴ, — although as well after the events of the first six seals, as after the interposed ch. vii, a certain fulness of significant contents is to be expected, — the question for which neither reasons are assigned, nor to which an answer is in any way given in the context itself, is raised; viz., as to what that σιγή "means," i.e, what historical fact, what state of the world or Church, is typified by that σιγή whose allegorical meaning is presupposed. And this question arbitrarily raised can be answered only arbitrarily: the σιγή means the sabbath rest of the Church after the plagues of the first six seals,[1] "the beginning of the eternal rest,"[2] the thousand-years rest before the final end,[3] or perhaps, in case the sixth seal be not regarded as extending so far, the rest of the Church under Constantine.[4] As to what the σιγή "means," expositors of an entirely different class have investigated also when they even with formal correctness acknowledged that not only does the seventh seal contain that σιγή, but also the seven trumpets introduce it. Here belong especially the expositors who refer ch. viii. also to the events of the Romano-Judaic war. According to Grot., the σιγὴ (ἐν τ. οὐρ.) is the brief rest of the winds of vii. 1 (which are at the four corners *of the earth*!). Wetst. explains more minutely: "Since all things now looked to a revolt of the Jews, a *brief pause* followed by the intervention of Agrippa and the priests."[5] Alcas.: "The remarkable forbearance of Christians who silently endured persecution from the Jews." Against all these arbitrary explanations, we must hold fast simply to the text, which says that at the opening of the seventh seal a profound silence occurred in heaven, where the sealed book was opened, — a silence which "signifies" something earthly, as little as the speech and songs heard in heaven at the opening of the preceding seals. But thereby the knowledge is gained that such silence occurs just because of the peculiar contents of this seal. Thereby, besides, the exposition is preserved from the second offence against the context, with which not only Beda but also Ebrard, etc., are chargeable, viz., the idea of a recapitulation in the entire series of trumpet-visions. For what Beda expressly says[6] is said essentially not only by Vitr., but also, e.g., by Ebrard, when he passes the opinion that in the trumpets, "a retrogression, *as it were*, is taken," viz., by the representation "of classes and kinds of judicial punishments which belong only to the godless,[7]

[1] Beda, Hofm., Christiani.
[2] Vict., Primas.
[3] Lange.
[4] Laun, Brightm.
[5] Josephus, *B. J.*, ii. 15, 2.
[6] "But now he recapitulates from the origin, in order to say the same things in another way."
[7] Cf., on the other hand, the general remarks above on ch. vii.

and that, too, not first after or with the sixth seal, but *even already before.*" In exegetical principle, this exposition stands upon a line with the one of N. de Lyra, who, by the theory of recapitulation, explains that only the conflict of the Church with heretics is portrayed, after[1] its conflict against tyrants, the heathen oppressors, is stated. Accordingly, the exposition in the trumpet-visions can recur again to the centuries of Church history, from which, on the other side, all sort of facts have already been gathered for ch. vi., in order to show the fulfilment of prophecy. The only apparent occasion which the context gives for the idea that the trumpet-visions recur again before the sixth seal — an idea which has led not only to the further statement that the individual trumpets in some way concur with the individual seals, but also to numberless and unlimited attempts to find the fulfilment of the individual trumpet-visions in historical events — lies in the fact that the final catastrophe, the extreme end, whose description is to be expected after chs. vi. and vii. in the seventh seal, does not yet, at least immediately, appear.[2] But the expedient adopted here by many expositors to limit the contents of the seventh seal to ver. 1, and to understand the σιγὴ ἐν τ. οὐρ. as the eternal rest of the perfected Church, or the eternal silencing of condemned enemies, has been proved to be mistaken. Yet that difficulty is solved by the view, attained already by Ew., Lücke, De Wette, Rinck,[3] into the skilful, carefully designed plan of the entire book, which here, just from the fact that from the last seal a new series of visions is to proceed, describes the trial of the patience of saints who are regarded as awaiting the day of the Lord;[4] but at the same time the expectation excited by the events of the first six seals, and increased by the entire ch. vii., as well as by the silence occurring at the opening of the seventh seal, that in this last seal the final completion is to come, in no way deceives, since the full conclusion is actually disclosed in the seventh seal, although only through a long series of visions in whose chain the trumpet-visions themselves form only the first members.[5]

Ver. 2. καὶ εἶδον. By the same formula, John has indicated what the seals previously opened enabled him to behold.[6] What he describes in vv. 2–6, he has therefore beheld, not after the conclusion of the silence, ver. 1,[7] but during it.[8] The entire scene is silent, until (ver. 5) by the fire cast into the earth, thunderings and voices (from beneath, from the earth) are aroused, which then, interrupting the silence in heaven, give the signal, as it were, to the angels who are to use the trumpets received already in ver. 2. — τοὺς ἑπτὰ ἀγγέλους οἱ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ ἑστήκασιν. Doubly incorrect, Luther: "*Sieben Engel, die da traten vor Gott*" ["Seven angels who appeared before God"]. The words, as they sound, are to be understood in no way otherwise than that

[1] Up to vi. 17.

[2] Other reasons, as that asserted by Ebrard: "How could the third part of the sun and moon be darkened (viii. 12), after they have first lost all their light" (vi. 12)? — from which it would follow that vi. 12 actually belongs *after* viii. 12, — may be contradicted directly from their own standpoint. For against *such* considerations, it may be said: How can vi. 12 speak of the *entire* moon, when in viii. 12 the third of it is already eclipsed?

[3] Cf. also Beng.

[4] Cf. xiii. 10, xiv. 12.

[5] Cf. Introduction, p. .

[6] Cf. vi. 1, 2, 5, 8, 12.

[7] Ebrard. [8] Aret., Herd., Rinck.

John, just as Tob. xii. 15,[1] speaks of seven particular angels, who, with a certain precedency above all the rest, stand before God. They are not called "archangels."[2] They can be identified[3] with the seven spirits of God[4] only by misunderstanding that expression. But when Hengstenb. and Ebrard assert that the number of angels who stand before God is fixed at seven only because of the seven trumpets, and do not hinder us from thinking of more than just seven to whom belongs the prerogative of "standing before God;" and when Ebrard, in order to give another application to the definite article which conflicts with this, attempts to contrast the seven angels, ver. 2, to the four angels, vii. 1, — they are only useless pretexts, in order to avoid the unambiguously expressed idea of just seven angels standing before God. The older interpreters, as Luther, Vitr., reached the same conclusion more readily by regarding the article as a Heb. redundancy; yet many also[5] have without prejudice recognized the thought required by the text. — *καὶ ἐδόθησαν αὐτοῖς ἑπτὰ σάλπιγγες.* The purpose becomes immediately manifest to John; cf. vv. 6, 7 sqq. To the inhabitants of heaven, who, after the opening of the seal, see how to those chief angels trumpets are given, the vast significance of this matter is clear in advance: hence their silence.

Vv. 3–5. *ἄλλος ἄγγελος.* The repeated[6] reference here to Christ[7] has occasioned the greatest number of arbitrary expedients in the interpretation of what follows: e.g., that by *ἔχων λιβ. χρυσ.*, reference is made to the self-sacrifice of Christ;[8] that the *ἐγέμισεν, κ.τ.λ.*, ver. 5, is to be understood of the fulness of the Godhead, or Spirit, in Christ;[9] that the fire cast upon the earth is to be regarded as a gracious visitation,[10] as the power of the gospel concerning Christ's love;[11] and the *φωναί, βρονταί, ἀστραπαί*, of the words and miracles of Christ, and *σείσμος*, of the movement occasioned thereby among the hearers.[12] The "other angel," just as the one mentioned in vii. 2, is to be regarded an actual angel;[13] yet the text gives no more accurate designation whatever.[14] — *ἐστάθη ἐπὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου.* The *ἐπὶ* does not mean *juxta*, "alongside of," and nothing more;[15] but it designates with evident exactness, that the angel so presents himself at the altar, that he rises above it.[16] — The question started here, as on vi. 9, as to whether the altar is to be regarded an altar of incense,[17] or an altar for burnt offerings,[18] will be decided not only from the context in itself, but also from the seeming type, Lev. xvi. 12; and Ebrard thus comes to the decision that the altar, mentioned ver. 3*a* (*ἐπὶ τ. θυσιαστ.*) and ver. 5, is the altar for burnt offerings, while "the golden altar" (ver. 3*b*) is the altar of incense. But as the

[1] "I am Raphael, one of the seven holy angels, which present the prayers of the saints, and which go in and out before the glory of the Holy One."
[2] De Wette, Stern.
[3] Aret., Ew.
[4] iv. 5.
[5] C. a Lap., Beng.
[6] Cf. vii. 2.
[7] Beda, Vieg., Zeger, Vitr., Calov., Böhmer.
[8] "Himself having become the censer" (Beda).
[9] John iii. 34; Col. ii. 9. Beda.
[10] Luke xii. 49. Beda.
[11] Calov.
[12] Beda, etc.
[13] So here also Hengstenb.
[14] Against Grot.: "The angel of the prayers of the Church."
[15] Grot., Beng.; cf. also Hengstenb., Ebrard, etc.
[16] Cf. Am. ix. 1.
[17] Grot., De Wette, Hengstenb.
[18] Vitr., Beng., Züll., Hofm.

question itself is not without an arbitrary assumption, so the answers, also, are without sufficient foundation in the context, into which strange conceptions of many kinds have entered. As to the appeal to Lev. xvi., that passage is essentially different from ours, because it is there said that the high priest, on the great day of atonement, is to take coals in a censer from the altar of burnt offerings, and with it and the incense strewed thereon, shall come, not to the altar of incense in the sanctuary,[1] but to the ark of the covenant within the holy of holies. Nothing, therefore, is said in Lev. xvi. 12, of the altar of incense, so that the analogy of that passage, even apart from a dissimilarity otherwise in the whole and in details, renders any proof impossible that "the golden altar," ver. 3, is the altar of incense. In general, however, the entire description of heavenly locality, as it is presented in iv. 1, gives us no right whatever for conceiving of the same as after the model of the earthly temple with a holy of holies, a holy place, a veil, different altars, etc., whereby then such conceptions are rendered necessary, as that of Züll., Hengstenb., that in ch. iv. and this passage, the veil before the holy of holies is closed, but in xi. 19 it is opened; or that of Hofm., that we must fancy the roof of the heavenly temple absent, in order to render possible the idea that "Jehovah appears enthroned above the cherubim, yet without a sight being gained of the ark of the covenant." Entirely arbitrary, also, is the explanation of Ebrard: "that the entire scene, ch. iv., was plainly visible, indeed, at the beginning without the temple, and that later[2] a heavenly temple appeared, as it were, upon a lower terrace, below and in front of the elevation on which the throne stood." The description of the scenery, iv. 1 sqq., is destitute throughout of any express representation of a heavenly temple. Such a representation, including the ark of the covenant, appears first at xi. 19,[3] just where the scene is changed. In the scenery which has remained unchanged from iv. 1, "the altar" becomes noticeable in vi. 9, which, according to the context, must be regarded as having a certain analogy with the altar of burnt-offering, although on this account it must not be considered that the entire heavenly locality, with the throne of God, and "the sea of glass," appears as the temple. For the article already compels us to identify the altar mentioned in ver. 3*a* with that of vi. 9. To infer, however, that, as in ver. 3*a*, only τ. θυσιαστ., and in ver. 3*b*, τ. θυσιαστ. τὸ χρυσοῦν is mentioned, so in two clauses of ver. 3 two different altars are designated, is a precipitate inference, since it is not at all remarkable that a more definite description is not given until ver. 3*b*, where an employment at the altar is spoken of. On the altar, which in vi. 9 appears as in a certain respect having the character of an altar of burnt-offering, incense is burned, whereby a certain analogy with the altar of incense is obtained; but the interpretation is entirely inconceivable, since the altar is regarded as fully corresponding neither with the one nor the other.[4] — ἔχων λιβανωτὸν χρυσοῦν. Without doubt λιβανωτός elsewhere means incense;[5] but no necessity fol-

[1] Ebrard.

[2] First in vi. 9, and, in its more definite determination, viii. 3 sqq.

[3] Cf. xv. 5.

[4] Also against Ew. ii.

[5] 1 Chron. ix. 29, LXX. Cf. the Scholiast. on Aristophanes, *Nubb.*: λίβανος — αὐτὸ τὸ δένδρον, λιβανωτὸς δὲ ὁ καρπὸς τοῦ λιβάνου.

lows, hence, for writing in this passage, where a vessel for incense is manifestly meant, instead of *ὁ λιβανωτός*, *ἡ λιβανωτίς*, or *λιβανωτρίς*,[1] or *τὸ λιβανωτόν*,[2] of which, besides, the latter form, in its proper sense, cannot be distinguished from *ὁ λιβανωτός*. — *καὶ ἐδόθη* — *ἵνα δώσει ταῖς προσευχαῖς*, κ.τ.λ. It is arbitrary to adjust[3] the difficult dat. *ταῖς προσευχαῖς*, by erasing the words *ταῖς προς τ. ἁγ. παντ.* (ver. 3) and *τ. προς τ. ἁγ.* (ver. 4), or to change it into *τὰς προσευχάς*,[4] or without this emendation to explain it in the sense of Grot.[5] Incorrect, too, is the effort to complete it by substituting *ἐν*, so as to make the meaning: "In the midst of prayers."[6] The dat. in ver. 3, in its combination with *δώσει*, is without all difficulty, since it is entirely regular[7] to express the remote object towards which the giving is directed: "in order that he should give (the *θυμ. πολλ.*) to the prayers of all saints." The significance of this act was correctly described already by Calov.: "that he should give *ταῖς πρ.*, to the prayers of the saints, the same things, i.e., to render these prayers of good odor."[8] For upon the ground of ver. 3, the expression, ver. 4, *καὶ ἀνέβη ὁ καπνὸς τῶν θυμιαμάτων ταῖς προσευχαῖς τ. ἁγ.* is to be explained; but not in the mode of Ebrard,[9] who attempts to interpret it, *ὁ καπν. τῶν θυμ. τῶν ταῖς προσευχ. δοθέντων* [the smoke of the incense given to the prayers], — by regarding the dat. here as "standing for the gen. of possession," after the manner of the Hebrew ל, — for the immediate combination of the dat. *ταῖς πρ.* with the conception *τ. θυμ.*, is contrary to all Greek modes of thought and expression;[10] but the dat. *ταῖς προσευχ.* can, in its relation to *ὁ καπν. τ. θυμ.*, depend only upon the verb *ἀνέβη*, as, in accordance with the idea expressed in ver. 3, it must be regarded a *dat. commodi*: "The smoke of the incense for the prayers rose up," i.e., indicating their being heard.[11] The view of Kliefoth, that the incense serves only to carry up the prayers, appears to me not to agree well with the expression, ver. 13, *ἵνα δώσ. τ. προσευχ.* And the idea that the prayers are sure of being heard, — not merely rendered capable of being granted, — which Klief. tries to avoid, is nevertheless prominent. — Besides, the activity of the angel, described in vv. 3, 4, in no way establishes the inference of an angelic intercession,[12] in the sense of Roman-Catholic dogmatics. In the first place, it is in general impracticable to transform the individual points of Apocalyptic visions directly into dogmatical results; and then, in this case, the function ascribed to the angel, just as to the twenty-four elders in v. 8, is in no way properly that of a mediator, but of a servant.[13] The incense, therefore, which he gives the prayers of saints, has first been given him; the angel thus in no way effects it by himself, that the

[*λίβανος* — the tree itself; but *λιβανωτὸς*, the fruit of the tree]; and Ammonius: *λίβανος μὲν γὰρ κοινῶς καὶ τὸ δένδρον καὶ τὸ θυμιώμενον· λιβανωτὸς δὲ μόνον τὸ θυμιώμενον* [*λίβανος*, in common both the tree and the incense; *λιβανωτὸς*, the incense only].

[1] Grot.

[2] Wolf.

[3] Schöttg.

[4] Castalio, Grot.

[5] "He received much incense, that he might cast this incense, which is the prayers of all saints, upon the altar."

[6] Eichh., Heinr.

[7] Winer, p. 196.

[8] Cf. Vitr., Ew., De Wette, Ebrard.

[9] Cf. already Castalio, also Ew. ii.

[10] For even the LXX. in the passages cited by Ebrard (2 Sam. iii. 2; Deut. i. 3) renders the Hebrew preposition by the gen.

[11] Cf. Winer, p. 203.

[12] Boss. [13] Bengel, etc.

prayers brought by his hand are acceptable to God, but the prayers of the saints can be received before God, even without any service of the angel, just because they proceed from saints;[1] and that now they are carried before God as a heavenly incense-offering by the angel, to be heard and immediately fulfilled, lies also not in his own will, but in that of God, who in the seventh seal is just about to execute his judgment, and from whom himself comes the incense, whose perfume, indicating the hearing of the prayers of the saints, ascends from the hand of the angel as the ministering spirit,[2] or the fellow-servant of the saints,[3] who are themselves priests.[4] — *καὶ ἐίλῃφεν, κ.τ.λ.* The angel had put down his censer after he had poured its contents (ver. 3) on the altar,[5] while the smoke ascended (ver. 4). Now (ver. 5) he again takes it into his hand for a service that is new, but inwardly connected with what has happened in vv. 3, 4; from the same fire of the altar which had consumed the incense, he fills his censer, and then casts these glowing coals, taken from the altar, upon the earth;[6] in consequence of this, there are voices, thunderings, lightnings, and an earthquake, the signs of the Divine judgment now breaking forth, as the seven angels also, as soon as the noise breaking the heavenly silence rises from the earth, make ready to sound their trumpets (ver. 6). The inner connection between ver. 5 and vv. 3 and 4 has been correctly described already by C. a Lap.: "Through the petitions of the saints, praying for vengeance upon the godless and their persecutors, fiery vengeance, i.e., thunderings, lightnings, and the succeeding plagues of the seven angels and trumpets, are sent down upon the godless."[7] The idea has been suggested by Ebrard, that the fire of judgment is that "in which the martyrs were burned;" this is not once said in vi. 10, although in this passage the idea is positively expressed that the fire which was cast upon the earth is from that whereby the incense was consumed, so that the judgment, therefore, appears to be a consequence of the heard prayers. For hereby, also, the chief contents of the prayers of all saints, and not merely those of martyrs (vi. 10), are made known. They have as their object that to which all the hopes and endurance of the saints in general are directed, viz., the coming of the Lord,[8] and the judgment accompanying it; the martyrs also in their way prayed for this.

Ver. 6. The half-hour silence in heaven is now at an end; after the fire, whose meaning also becomes manifest by the threatening signs immediately following (ver. 5), has been cast upon the earth, the seven angels (ver. 2) prepare to sound their trumpets. — *ἡτοίμασαν ἑαυτ.* This includes the grasping of the trumpets in such a way that they could bring them to their mouths.[9]

Vv. 7–12. The first four trumpets are expressly distinguished by ver. 13, from the last three. The instrument with which the terrible war alarm[10] and signals of various other kinds are given[11] is employed by the seven

[1] Cf. v. 8, vi. 10.
[2] Cf. ver. 5 sqq.
[3] Heb. i. 14.
[4] xix. 10.
[5] Cf. i. 6, v. 10, vii. 15.
[6] Cf. Ezek. x. 2.
[7] Cf. Beng., Ew., De Wette, Hengstenb.
[8] Cf. xxii. 17, 20.
[9] Cf. C. a Lap., Beng.
[10] Job xxxix. 25.
[11] Cf. Winer, *Rwb.*, ii. 147: *Musikal. Instrum.*

angels to signalize a series of threatening signs preceding the judgment which is to enter at the coming of the Lord; but just as from the opened seals the impending visitations themselves come forth, so from the trumpets — the comparison of which, in other respects, with the sevenfold trumpet-blasts before Jericho is very remote [1] — not a mere sound, which could give the signal for the expected horrors, but in consequence of the trumpet-blast, the very things themselves to be announced are presented to the gazing prophet. This is not acknowledged by those interpreters who have imagined that while the good angels, whose trumpet-tones through evangelical preachers like Hus, Luther, etc., from the time of the apostles until the end of the world have not been silenced, call to Christ, a conflict is raised by Satan, who cast (ver. 7) hail and fire (i.e., erroneous doctrine) upon the earth, so that the trees (i.e., the teachers of godliness) and the grass (i.e., ordinary Christians) are injured.[2] — Other distorted explanations, as the opinion of Bengel, that the prayers of the saints (vv. 3 sqq.) and the trumpets of the angels are contemporaneous, and the conjecture of Ebrard, that the first six trumpets occur before the sealing of ch. vii.,[3] or, — as the subject also is changed, — that "the sealing in reference to the first four trumpet-visions is intended to represent only a relation, but in reference to the last three, an event," [4] — are decided already by the general remarks on ch. vii. and on viii. 1. Arbitrary interpretations of this kind necessarily accompany the effort to derive the "meaning" of the trumpet-visions from allegorizing.

Ver. 7. When the *first* angel sounded the trumpet, "there followed hail and fire mingled with blood, and they were cast upon the earth." The plague is like that of Egypt, Exod. ix. 24 sqq., only that with the hail and fire, i.e., masses of fire,[5] there is no lightning;[6] nor is there any thing said of a wind, as perhaps the Prester of Plin., *H. N.* ii. 49,[7] but blood [8] is to be added, with which both the hail and fire are mingled.[9] The ἐν with αἵματι enables us to see the original meaning still more clearly, as, e.g., vi. 8: the blood appears as the mass wherein hail and fire are found.[10] The expression μεμιγμ. ἐν αἱμ. does not give the idea of a "rain of blood." Entirely distorted, however, is the explanation of Eichh.: "While the hail was falling, a *shower* also poured in the midst of flashes of lightning so rapidly following one another, that the shower itself *seemed to be red* with the reflected flames of the lightning." The plague in this passage differs from that described in Exod. ix. 24 sqq., also in the fact that there the devastation was wrought by the hail, but here by the fire: κατεκάη. — τὸ τριτον τῆς γῆς. De Wette properly thinks only of the surface of the earth, with that which is upon it. Yet neither the especially prominent trees,[11] the third part of

[1] Vitr., Rinck, Hengstenb., etc.
[2] Aret., Zeger, etc.
[3] p. 311.
[4] p. 581.
[5] De Wette.
[6] Ebrard.
[7] Ew. i.
[8] Cf. John iii. 3.
[9] The var. μεμιγμένον of ℵ is not a bad interpretation, since the hail does not appear mingled with fire in the blood, but only the fire is combined with the blood. The effect also, which is ascribed only to the fire, corresponds well with this. But for a change of text the authority of ℵ is insufficient.
[10] Cf. Matt. vii. 2. Winer, p. 363.
[11] Cf. vii. 1, 3.

which are consumed, nor the green grass all of which is burned, are to be regarded upon only that third part of the earth; but besides the τρίτον τῆς γῆς, also (καὶ) the third part of all the trees, and besides (καὶ) all the grass (upon the whole earth). — To explain what is here beheld by John as in any way allegorical, and thus to bring out the assumed "meaning" of the whole, and of its individual features, is an undertaking, which, since it has no foundation in the text, can lead only to what is arbitrary. Beda, according to whom there is described in ver. 7 the destruction of the godless in general, refers the entire portrayal to "the punishment of hell." Luther, who begins in general with chs. vii. and viii. the prophecy of spiritual tribulations, i.e., of heresies, and then progresses to the Papacy, thinks here of Tatian and the Encratites. Grotius says, "The first trumpet explains the *cause* of the rest," and explains χάλαζα = "the hardening of the hearts of the Jews;" πῦρ μεμ. ἐν αἵμ. = "sanguinary rage." "Civil insurrections"[1] and wars are suggested, not only by those who everywhere find the Romano-Judaic disturbances, but also by Beng.[2] and Hengstenb.[3] Vitr. refers to the plague and famine in the times of Decius and Gallus.[4] Stern explains persecutions of the Church by the heathen, erroneous doctrines,[5] and worldly wars in the Roman Empire. Ebrard understands the spiritual famine as it occurs in such Catholic lands as have rejected the light of the Reformation.

Vv. 8, 9. Upon the sound of the *second* trumpet, follows a sign which exercises its injurious effects upon the sea, together with creatures living therein and on ships. — ὡς ὄρος — θάλασσαν. Ebrard's view, that a volcano was torn away from its station along the seacoast by the force raging within, and cast into the sea, conflicts with the ὡς as well as with the idea lying in the connection, that the ἐβλήθη (cf. ver. 7) occurred by a special, wonderful, Divine working.[6] The meaning of the ὡς was given already by N. de Lyra.[7] By the comparison with a great mountain all on fire, only the dreadful greatness of the fiery mass is made manifest, which, if we consider its source in general, must be regarded as coming from heaven (cf. v. 7). Hence it cannot in any way be said,[8] that the form of the representation is taken from that of a volcano. An allusion to Jer. li. 21[9] is entirely out of place.[10] The effect (ver. 8*b*, ver. 9) is described after the model of the Egyptian plague, Exod. vii. 20 sqq., only that here it is not as there all the water, but, in analogy with ver. 7, 10 sqq., 12 sqq., a third that becomes blood, and likewise a third of living creatures and ships that is destroyed. — τὰ ἔχοντα ψυχάς. The expression designates all living creatures. The nom. apposition to τῶν κτισμ. τῶν ἐν τ. θαλ. stands like iii. 12, ix. 14, xiv. 20, without construction. — The allegorizing commentators guess here and there without any foundation, because the text throughout contains nothing allegorical.

[1] Wetst., Herd., etc.

[2] Wars under Trajan and Hadrian. The "earth" is Asia, as vii. 1; but the "trees," not as vii. 1, Africa, but eminent Jews. The "grass" designates ordinary Jews.

[3] Who interprets the "trees" and "grass" just as Beng.

[4] "Globes of fire mixed with hail *prefigured* the plague enkindled among men from the sulphurous material of the atmosphere."

[5] By which the trees themselves, i.e., bishops and priests, were injured.

[6] Cf. Hengstenb.

[7] "A vast glowing globe." [8] Vitr., Ew.

[9] δώσω σε ὡς ὄρος ἐμπεπυρισμένον.

[10] Against Vitr.

Beda[1] explains the whole: "As the Christian religion grew, the Devil swollen with pride, and burning with the fire of his own fury, was cast into the sea of the world." On τ. ἔχ. ψυχ. he remarks: "those alive, but spiritually dead." Luther: "Marcion, the Manichaeans, etc." Grot. may be considered the representative of the expositors who make conjectures in general concerning the distresses of the Romano-Judaic war. According to him, ὄρος, κ.τ.λ., designates the citadel of Antony, i.e., the soldiers therein who threw themselves with madness (καιόμ.) into the city (ἐβλ. εἰς τ. θαλ.), killed men (ἀπεθάνε, κ.τ.λ.), and stole what was movable (τ. πλοίων). Also Vitr., Beng., Stern, yea, even Hengstenb., understand the whole as referring to the devastation of war, while they interpret the details with lack of judgment like Grot.,[2] and only differ from him in that Vitr., etc., find the inroads of the Goths into the Roman Empire, and Hengstenb., wars in general, prophesied. Hengstenb. has the view in general, that, in all the trumpet-visions except the last, the same thing is represented, viz., war.[3] According to Ebrard, the whole means that "the vulcanic, Titanic energy of covetous or pleasure-seeking egoism poisons the intercourse of men, the intellectual as well as especially the domestic."

Vv. 10, 11. The *third* trumpet brings a poisoning of a third part of the rivers and fountains of waters (upon the land), and thereby the death of many men. — If, therefore, a certain connection with the second trumpet-vision be found in the fact that damage to the other waters follows that done to the sea, yet the two visions need in no way be drawn together, not even in reference to the so-called fulfilment.[4] The nature of the damage of ver. 10 is entirely different from that of ver. 8; it is also, in ver. 11, intended for men. In general, however, the preparatory visitations represented by the trumpet — just as by the seal-visions — are so directed that one blow follows another until finally the Lord comes. — ἔπεσεν ἐκ τ. οὐρ. ἀστήρ, κ.τ.λ. That the star "itself is abandoned to ruin, and, hence, has been torn from its place,"[5] is a statement entirely out of place. The text marks only the ruinous effect which the star is to have; but in connection therewith lies the idea, that, just to produce the effect intended by God, the falling of the star has been caused by the determinate Divine will. — The words καιόμενοσ ὡς λαμπάς make it manifest, that the great star which John saw fall from heaven had a luminous flame, but in no way show that "the great star" was any meteor, comet, or falling star.[6] — καὶ ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὸ τρίτον τῶν ποταμῶν, κ.τ.λ. If any one should ask how this is to happen, the answer may be given with Ebrard, that the star in its fall is to be scattered so that its "sparks and fragments may fly into the water;" but the question and answer come from a consideration not belonging to the text. — ὁ Ἄψινθος. The masc. form, instead of the usual τὸ ἀψίνθιον or ἡ ἄψινθος, is chosen because of its congruence with ὁ ἀστήρ.[7] The name designating[8] the nature of the star declares

[1] Cf. Zeg., etc.

[2] The "ships," e.g., are, according to Vitr., small states; according to Hengstenb., cities and villages; the "fish" are in Hengstenb., just as in Grot., men slain by the raging warriors.

[3] Matt. xxiv. 7.

[4] Against Ebrard. Cf. on vv. 8, 9.

[5] Ebrard.

[6] Against C. a Lap., Wetst., Züll., etc.

[7] Ew.

[8] Cf. vi. 8.

its effect (ἐπικράνθησαν). — τὸ τρίτον τῶν ὑδάτων. From this combination of the previously mentioned ποταμοί and πηγαὶ ὑδάτων, the result is expressly, that already in ver. 10 the third of the πηγ. ὑδ. is to be thought of, which is clear also from the connection with τὸ τρίτον τ. ποτ. — ἐγένετο — εἰς ἄψινθον. The same thing is indicated by ἐπικράνθησαν. By the falling star "Wormwood," the waters are made wormwood-water whose poisonous bitterness brings death to many men. The consideration that wormwood[1] is no deadly poison, is not at all pertinent, because it is not natural wormwood that is here treated of. — ἐκ τ. ὑδ. Cf. ix. 18; Winer, p. 344. The cause appears as the source from which the effect comes.

The star falling from heaven (the Church), which makes the waters bitter and poisonous, is readily interpreted by allegorical expositors as heresy. So Beda: "Heretics falling from the summit of the Church attempt, with the flame of their wickedness, to taint the fountains of divine Scriptures." More definitely still, N. de Lyra, who had referred the two preceding trumpets to Arius and Macedonius: "Pelagius, who preached contrary to the sweetness of the Holy Spirit." Luther: "Origen, who by philosophy and reason imbittered and corrupted the Scriptures, as the high schools with us have done until the present." Vitr., Beng., etc., refer it to Arius. Mede understands Romulus Augustulus; Laun., Gregory the Great. But to the expositors who find everywhere in the Apoc. the particular facts of the history of the Church and the world represented, such matters are not subject to the option of an allegorizing interpretation, as they refer all to events contemporaneous with John. Thus in the star, Grot. finds the Egyptian mentioned in Acts xxi. 38; while Herder, whose opinion Böhmer has reproduced, finds Eleazar,[2] "a fiery, audacious young man, the prime originator of the spirit of the zealots," through whom the "animosity" was first aggravated. Hengstenb. also here traces again the war. Stars he regards as signifying, in general, sovereigns; "the fire with which the great star burns is the fire of wrath, war, and conquest;" the water of the streams is "a symbol of prosperity:" the whole designates, therefore, the calamity of war.

Ver. 12. The *fourth* trumpet brings damage to sun, moon, and stars, whereof the third of all is darkened, and thus the light is withdrawn from a third of the day and of the night. ἐπλήγη. That a "preternatural striking" is to be thought of,[3] which has as its consequence the intended darkening (ἵνα σκοτ.), Wolf already mentions, in opposition to the leaning towards the rabbinical way, whereby the darkening itself of sun and moon is represented as a "smiting."[4] The miraculous eclipse is in itself, as already according to the O. T. representation,[5] a foretoken of the coming day of judgment;[6] the limitation of the same, however, to a third of the sun, moon, and stars, and consequently to a third of the day and night ruled over by them,[7] corresponds to similar statements in the preceding trumpet-visions. — καὶ ἡ ἡμέρα μὴ φάνῃ,

[1] Cf. Winer, *Rwb., in loc.*
[2] Jos., *B. Jud.*, ii. 17.
[3] Cf. Exod. vii. 25.
[4] Succa, p. 29, 1: "When the sun is struck, it is a bad sign to the whole world." In Wetst.
[5] John iii. 4; Am. viii. 9. Cf. Exod. x. 21 sqq. [6] Cf. also vi. 12 sqq. [7] Gen. i. 16.

viz., as the apposition τὸ τρίτον αὐτῆς more explicitly says, the third part of the day. And likewise the night. The words cannot mean that the light proceeding from the smitten stars has lost the third of its brilliancy, the reverse of Isa. xxx. 26;[1] still less does the expression bear the explanation of Ebrard, "that the third of the stars was smitten with respect to *time*, so that they were darkened only for a third of the day, contrasted with night-time, while for the other two-thirds they are bright." But the idea is this: Since a third of the sun is eclipsed, a third of the day (regarded in its temporal length) is deprived of its sunlight, and the night likewise of the shining of moon and stars. So De Wette, who judges likewise that here the sameness between the third of the stars and the third of day and night "is carried out even to what is unnatural." The exception is correctly taken, and therefore expressed without impiety, because the present vision of John is to him as little as all the rest an absolutely objective incident, a likeness presented him by God as complete;[2] of course, also, no real fiction,[3] but a view communicated through the prophet's own subjectivity.

The allegorical expositors find here[4] the obscuration, confusion, and diminution of beneficial institutions, whether of a spiritual or a political kind. Beda proposes the disturbance of the Church by false brethren; N. de Lyra, the heresy of Eutyches. The injury done by Islam is understood by Stern, who mentions the fact, that instead of the full moon the Church has become a *half* moon (ἐπλήγη — τὸ τρίτον τ. σελ.), and many stars have vanished, i.e., the sees of many bishops have been overthrown. Wetst.,[5] Herder, etc., propose political confusion; so, too, Vitr., Beng., who, however, have in mind the incursions of the Goths and Vandals into the Eastern Empire, and Hengstenb., who very generally understands sad times full of the calamities of war. Böhmer combines the reference to Jewish temporal relations with his interpretation of sun and moon as applying to spiritual things, already employed on vi. 12: "That sun and moon and stars are smitten with darkness, we explain from the fact that sad prophecies have transpired, and the law has begun to be neglected. But the end of prophecy and the law has not, as yet, actually come, on which account only a third thereof is regarded as having been obscured."

Concerning the visions coming with the first four trumpets, which are to be distinguished from the three immediately following (ver. 13), it is to be remarked in general: 1. The plagues described in them, which concern the entire sphere of the visible world (the earth, ver. 7; the sea, vv. 8, 9; the waters of the main land, vv. 10, 11; the stars, day and night, ver. 12; cf. Beng., Ew., etc.), are perceptible not only to unbelievers, but also to believers.[6] This necessarily lies in the very nature of the plagues; and the sealing correctly understood (vii. 2 sqq.) in no way gives any other idea.[7] 2. The allegorical explanation, and the reference founded thereon to events

[1] Beng., Züll., Böhmer, Klief.

[2] Against the inspiration theory of Hengstenb., etc.

[3] Against Eichh., Ew., De Wette, etc.

[4] Cf. vi. 12 sqq.

[5] "There was pure ἀναρχία, the magistrates were despised, all Judaea conspired for sedition."

[6] Against De Wette, etc.

[7] Cf., on the other hand, ix. 4.

or circumstances of ecclesiastical or civil history, — of which Ebrard emphasizes the latter,[1] has no foundation whatever in the text, and, therefore, leads necessarily to arbitrary suppositions. But the context, according to which the trumpet-visions proceed from the seventh seal, shows that this vision, in its eschatological significance, has reference to the end to be expected already after the sixth [2] and in the seventh seal; viz., the actual coming of the Lord, in connection with which the plagues described by the first six seals are to be regarded as premonitory signs of the impending end of the same character as those described in the fundamental prophecy of Matt. xxiv. 29. The same relation as subsists there between ver. 29 and vv. 6, 7, recurs in the signs portrayed in the four trumpet-visions and those described in the seal-visions. It is true that the sixth seal already has introduced foretokens of the nature of Matt. xxiv. 29, and this is developed in close connection until the description of the last end; but by the fact that in vii. 1, between the sixth and seventh seals, the four angels come forth who are to bring a new plague, the final development is further postponed. And if now the final catastrophe actually proceeds from the seventh seal, — as is to be expected after vi. 17, — yet this occurs only after a further development, which, as first of all in the first four trumpet-visions, brings with it new foretokens of the coming end. The *introductory* significance of this sign is expressed in the fact that only a *third* of the earth is concerned; thus a new course is designated after the points marked by the already strong signs of the sixth seal. Yet that a progress occurs, and that the trumpet-visions do not, in any way, again prevail before the sixth seal, the context indicates by the fact that the plagues befalling a *third* of the earth mark an advance when compared with the plagues of the fourth seal (vi. 8).

Ver. 13. An eagle flying in the zenith proclaims, by a threefold annunciation of woe, the three trumpets still remaining.[3] — *εἶδον καὶ ἤκουσα.* Cf. v. 11, vi. 1. — *ἑνὸς ἀετοῦ.* Concerning the indefinite meaning of the *εἷς*,[4] cf. Winer, p. 111. An eagle is mentioned, not an angel in the form of an eagle.[5] That it is an eagle which appears as the harbinger of the still impending woe, has its foundation, not in the "prophecy" of Christ, Matt. xxiv. 28, — for that passage contains no prophecy at all, but a proverbial assertion of the moral law upon which the threatening prophecies of the Lord depend, — nor is it to be regarded as an antithesis to the dove, John i. 32;[6] nor does the eagle come into consideration as a bird of omen,[7] for, apart even from the unchristian character of the idea, the evil omen does not lie in the eagle as such. But it is in the same way appropriate that the far-sounding, menacing cry of the mighty, dreadful eagle be raised, in which the irruption of devastating enemies is compared with the flight of the eagle to its plunder.[8] — *πετομένου ἐν μεσουρανήματι.* Cf. xiv. 6, xix. 17. Μεσου-

[1] Cf. also Hengstenb.
[2] vi. 12 sqq.
[3] Cf. ix. 12, xi. 14.
[4] xix. 17.
[5] Eich., Ew., Stern, De Wette, Bleek, etc. Cf. Critical Notes.
[6] Hengstenb.: "The eagle is sent to those who do not want the dove to descend upon them."
[7] Ewald.
[8] Deut. xxviii. 29; Hos. viii. 1; Hab. i. 8. Cf. Hengstenb.

ρανεῖν designates the sun's position in its meridian altitude; hence *μεσουράνημα* is first of all the astronomical relation which is occasioned by the sun's standing in the zenith.[1] According to this, the expression may designate the *μέσον οὐρανον*[2] as the place for the *μεσουρανεῖν* of the sun, but not the space between the vault of heaven and the earth.[3] The eagle flies to the meridian altitude of heaven, because the idea is thus given, that it can be seen and heard of all to whom its message pertains. — *τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*, as vi. 10. — *ἐκ τ. λοιπ. φων.* The *ἐκ*, for the same reason as ver. 11.[4] — *τῆς σάλπιγγος.* The sing. is not distributive,[5] but by its close connection with *τῶν φωνῶν* shows itself to be *one* conception.

Who or what the eagle properly is, cannot be properly decided here, as in Matt. xxiv. 28. Yet even here allegorical explanations are found. Beda: "The voice of this eagle daily penetrates the Church through the mouths of eminent teachers." C. a Lap.:[6] "Some prophet or other to be expected at the end of the world." According to Joachim, the eagle is Gregory the Great; according to N. de Lyra, John himself; according to Zeger, the Apostle Paul. Herder, etc., also Böhmer and Volkm., propose the eagle of the Roman legions.

[1] Eustathius, on *Π.*, ix. 63: *αἴξησις ἡμέρας λέγεται — τὸ ἀπὸ πρωΐας μέχρις ἡλιακοῦ μεσουρανήματος.* In Wetst.

[2] De Wette.

[3] Ew. i.

[4] Cf. Matt. xviii. 7: *ἀπό.*

[5] Beng.

[6] Cf. Rib.

CHAPTER IX.

Ver. 2. *καὶ ἠνοιξεν τὸ φρέαρ τῆς ἀβύσσου.* So, correctly, Elz., Beng., Griesb., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.], according to the best witnesses. The words lacking in ℵ, 6, 8, 9, al., Copt., al., are rejected by Mill (*Prolegg.*, 1434) and Matth. But the omission in the codd. is easily explained by the similar conclusion of ver. 1; just as in ver. 2, because of *καπνὸς* occurring twice, the words *καπν. ἐκ τ. φρ. ὡς* are omitted by some witnesses. Cf. Wetst. In an exegetical respect, the words *κ. ἠνοιξεν τ. φρ. τ. ἀβ.* are scarcely needed. — Ver. 4. *αὐτῶν.* Elz.: *αὐτῶν* (Tisch.). Apparently interpolated; deleted by Lach. [W. and H.] (A, ℵ, 12, 28). — Ver. 5. *βασανισθήσονται.* So Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.], according to A, ℵ, 12. The reading *βασανισθῶσι* (Elz.) arose, like the other variations, from the desire for conformity; cf. the preceding *ἀποκτείνωσιν.* — Ver. 6. Instead of *εὑρήσουσιν* (ℵ, Elz.), [W. and H.] read *εὑρωσιν* (A, 12, 17, 28, Beng., Lach., Tisch.), to which also the var. *εὑρήσωσιν* (2, 9, 11, al., Wetst.) points. — The fut. *οεύξεται* (Elz.) is an emendation, instead of the well-attested pres. *φεύγει* (Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]). ℵ: *φύγῃ.* — Ver. 10. *καὶ κέντρα ἦν ἐν ταῖς οὐραῖς αὐτῶν καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία αὐτῶν ἀδικῆσαι.* Thus Elz., but without attestation. In the beginning, it is undoubtedly to be read only *καὶ κέντρα* (A, ℵ, 17, al., Matth., Lach., Tisch.). In favor of the succeeding words, the reading of A, ℵ, 17, manifestly the *mater lectionis*, is decisive: *καὶ ἐν ταις οὐραὶς αὐτῶν ἡ ἐξουσία αὐτῶν ἀδικῆσαι, κ.τ.λ.* (Lach., Tisch.). In the other text-recensions, the emendizing hand is unmistakable, especially so in that received by Matth., and represented by a respectably large number of witnesses: *κ. ἐν τ. οὐρ. αὐτ. ἔχουσιν ἐξουσ. τοῦ ἀδικ.* Upon the foundations of inner criticism, next to the correct reading, that of the edition of Beng. commends itself: *καὶ κέντρα ἐν τ. ουρ. αὐτῶν ἡ ἐξουσ. αὐτῶν ἀδικ., κ.τ.λ.* — Ver. 12. Instead of *ἐρχονται* (Elz.), Matth. has written, in accord with preponderant testimony (ℵ): *ἐρχεται* (Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]). — Ver. 13. *τεσσάρων* is lacking in A, 28, Syr., Aeth., Ar., Vulg., Beda, is deleted by Lach. [W. and H.], and rejected also by Ebrard; Tisch. has again adopted it. Possibly it fell out because of its similarity with *κεράτων* (Beng.); but it was more probably interpolated in order to make an antithesis to the *φ. μίαν*, and a parallelism with the *τ. τέσσαρας ἀγγ.* (ver. 14). — Ver. 14. *ὁ ἔχων.* So, already, Beng. The emendation *ὅς εἶχε* (Elz.) is destitute of all critical value. — Ver. 16. *τοῦ ἵππου.* So Matth., Tisch., 1854, according to 2, 4, 8, al. The reading *τοῦ ἱππικοῦ* (ℵ, Elz., Beng., Tisch., 1859, IX. [W. and H.]), like the var. *τῶν ἵππων*, appears to be a correction. — *δισμυριάδες.* A, 11, 12, Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]. Also the var. *δισμυρίων* (18, Wetst.) points to the true reading. The *δύο μυριάδες* (ℵ, Elz., Beng.) is, like the mere *μυριάδες* in Matth., a correction. — The *καὶ* before *ἤκουσα* (Elz.) is certainly to be deleted (Beng., Matth., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]). — Ver. 20. *οὐ μετενόησαν.* This only intelligible reading is sufficiently attested by C, 4, 6, 16, al., Copt., Andr., Areth., and is properly preferred by Griesb., Matth., Tisch. [W. and H.], to the *οὔτε* (Vulg., Primas, Cypr., Elz., Beng,. Lach.). ℵ: *οὐδὲ.*

Vv. 1–12. The trumpet of the *fifth* angel brings the *first* woe,[1] viz., locusts from hell as a plague upon men not sealed (ver. 4; cf. vii. 1 sqq.).

Ver. 1. *ἀστέρα ἐκ τ. οὐρ. πεπτωκότα εἰς τ. γ.* Eichh. is incorrect in explaining the part. pf. as in form and meaning equivalent to *καταβαίνειν*. The star had already fallen from heaven to earth, and had become just as John saw it; the falling, also, is in no way a spontaneous descent, — possibly at God's command for a definite purpose,[2] — but the expression presupposes that the star was thrown down.[3] But the "star" is neither to be regarded as changed into a human form,[4] nor to be understood as a purely figurative designation of an angel,[5] but the idea of a star mingles with that of an angel, as in the O. T. view of the צְבָא הַשָּׁמַיִם.[6] The star fallen from heaven appears, consequently, not as a good,[7] but as a bad, angel,[8] who must serve only to bring a plague of an infernal character upon the godless: *καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ, κ.τ.λ.* This *ἐδόθη* would, of course, have its justification if the star were a heavenly servant; but in connection with the *πεπτωκότα*, the idea is significant that this infernal angel was expressly appointed a place in order to bring in the plagues inflicted by God otherwise than in xx. 1, where the angel "coming down" from heaven has in his hand the key of the abyss.[9] — *ἡ κλεὶς τοῦ φρέατος τῆς ἀβύσσου.* The *ἄβυσσος* (viz., *χώρα*), i.e., bottomless, the abyss, designates — like the Heb. תְּהוֹם, which the LXX. often render by *ἄβυσσος*[10] — the depths of the earth in the natural sense,[11] then *Sheol*, *Hades*, i.e., the place of abode of the departed in those depths,[12] but in the Apoc.,[13] and Luke viii. 31, the present[14] abode of the Devil and his angels From this *ἄβυσσος*, a *φρέαρ* (LXX. for בְּאֵר, "well," Gen. xxi. 30, xxvi. 15; cf. John iv. 11), regarded as proceeding and discharging over the surface of the earth, appears like a shaft[15] of some kind, possibly after the manner of wells or cisterns, to be closed; and hence the angel receives a key, in order, by descending into the deep, to open the shaft of the well, and thus to let out the smoke proceeding from the *ἄβυσσος* (ver. 2). [See Note LVI., p. 292.]

Vv. 2, 3. The smoke arising from the opened well, comparable to the smoke of a great furnace,[16] was so thick that thereby (*ἐν τ. καπν.*, cf. viii. 11) the sun and moon were obscured. — *ὁ ἥλιος καὶ ὁ ἀὴρ* is not an hendiadys,[17] but, according to the more natural view, it is apparent that both, viz., the sun and the air, are darkened by the thick mass of smoke. — *καὶ ἐκ τ. καπν. ἐξῆλθον ἀκρίδες εἰς τ. γ.* The *καπνός*, therefore, was not merely an apparent mass of smoke, yet in fact a dreadful swarm of locusts;[18] but the infernal

[1] Cf. viii. 13.
[2] Cf. xx. 1.
[3] vi. 13. Cf. Luke x. 18; Isa. xiv. 12.
[4] Vitr. Cf. Hengstenb.
[5] "An angel imitating a star in bright light and splendor."
[6] Cf. Ps. ciii. 21; Jer. xxxiii. 22; Job xxxviii. 7. Ewald, who compares xviii. 16, xxi. 1–6, in addition to Enoch, 84 sqq., lxxxix. 32.
[7] Beng., De Wette.
[8] Beda, who, however, like many of the old interpreters, understands it directly of the Devil; Volkm.
[9] Against Ew., etc.
[10] Also in the plural; Ps. lxxi. 21, cvii. 26.
[11] Gen. i. 2, vii. 11; Deut. viii. 7.
[12] Ps. lxxi. 21, cvii. 26; Rom. x. 7.
[13] ver. 11, xx. 1, 3. Cf. xi. 7, xvii. 8.
[14] Cf., on the other hand, Rev. xx. 10.
[15] The idea is otherwise in Ps. lv. 24, according to the Heb., as well as the LXX.
[16] Cf. Gen. xix. 28; Exod. xix. 18.
[17] "The air, so far as illumined by the sun" (Beng.).
[18] Vitr., Eichh., Züll., Ebrard.

smoke is the covering under which the miraculous locusts ascend, and from which they "come out," in order to execute the plagues with which they are commissioned.[1] Against the force of the words, Klief. explains: "The material for the locusts already existed on earth, but the smoke ascending from hell converts it into locusts." — *καὶ ἐδόθη — οἱ σκορπίοι τῆς γῆς.* The power given (cf. ver. 5) these locusts corresponds with their form and equipment (ver. 10). The *τῆς γῆς* with *οἱ σκορπίοι* does not refer to the distinction, which is here entirely out of place, between land- and sea-beasts,[2] but to the fact that the locusts are not from the earth; the infernal locusts receive a power like that of earthly scorpions. Hence no allusion should be made[3] to the statement of Jewish writings, that hell is full of scorpions.

Vv. 4, 5. There is here a further description as to how this plague of the locusts, proceeding from the abyss, is entirely different from that which the ordinary earthly locusts bring. — *καὶ ἐρρέθη αὐτ., κ.τ.λ.*, cf. vi. 11. The ready recollection of the Egyptian plague of locusts[4] makes the plague here appointed appear the more wonderful and dreadful. Not the grass and all the fresh verdure of field and trees, which are elsewhere devoured by locusts, are now regarded,[5] but only[6] men, those, viz., *διτινες οὐκ ἔχουσι τὴν σφραγῖδα, κ.τ.λ.* Only as those without the seal,[7] are they subjected to the plague proceeding from the abyss. The allegorizing interpretation of Beda and many others, according to which the rage of heretics (locusts) against the orthodox is regarded as here represented, miscarries — even though in its individual features it is refuted — chiefly in that, according to this exposition, the godly (the sealed) must appear as they who suffer. The explanation also which refers the entire trumpet-vision to the Jewish war, and understands by the locusts the Zealots, is also embarrassed on this point, so that Heinr. must remark: "We are unwilling to inquire here whether the Zealots were really grievous and pestilential to the better or the worse part of the race. The poet certainly imagines the latter." — The injury which, in ver. 4, the locusts were commanded to inflict upon men, is more precisely defined in ver. 5; viz., that they are to torment men with the scorpionic power given them, but are not to inflict death. — *ἐδόθη αὐτ. ἵνα, κ.τ.λ.* Cf. ver. 3. That the not killing is to be strictly taken, but that it is not to be said that "only the not killed draw attention to themselves, because their number is the greater, and their lot the harder,"[8] is shown by the tenor of the words, the antithesis *ἀλλ' ἵνα βασανισθήσονται*, and the further description, ver. 6. — *βασανισθήσονται.* It harmonizes well with the change of subject, that the indic. fut. now follows *ἵνα.* Cf. a similar change of inf. and indic. fut., vi. 4. — *μῆνας πέντε.* The allegorizing explanations depend, as always, upon extreme arbitrariness. Beda: "That heretics *temporarily* attack the good. For by five months it signifies the time of a generation, on account of the five senses which we use in this life." Others reckon five mystical months, as 5 × 30, i.e., 150 mystical days; i.e., ordinary years, which time is re-

[1] Cf. Ewald, De Wette, etc.
[2] Against Ew. i., without reference to Ew. ii.: "known to men."
[3] Ew. ii.
[4] Exod. x. 12–15. Cf. also Joel i. 2.
[5] Cf. also viii. 7.
[6] *εἰ μή.* Cf. Matt. xii. 4; Gal. i. 19, ii. 16.
[7] Cf. vii. 1 sqq.
[8] Hengstenb.

ferred by Vitr. to the dominion of the Goths, and by Calov. to the duration of Arianism. Bengel fixes five prophetic months as equal to 79½ years, and proposes the sufferings of the Jews in Persia during the sixth century, which were of that length. Utterly out of place is the reference to Gen. vii. 24;[1] or that to the five sins, ver. 20 sqq.,[2] for even if the number of sins were marked there in any way as five, it would nevertheless be preposterous if an entirely special feature of one vision found its significance not within this itself, but only in another. Yet the five months are not to be passed by as "mystical" without an explanation, as if this must be actually given only by its fulfilment.[3] Besides, Hengstenb. says, arbitrarily, the number five "is absolutely the sign of the half, unfinished, as the broken number. Five months are mentioned, because only the five, in its relation to the twelve months of the year, gives the idea of relatively long duration and dreadfulness;" against which Ebrard already replies that to this sense the number six, the half of the twelve months, would most simply correspond. Eichh., Ew., De Wette,[4] have properly recognized the designation of the five months as a feature in the vision, which is derived from the popular idea that the locusts usually appeared during the five months from May.[5] As generally the entire description of visionary locusts, however supernatural they appear, depends upon the basis of a natural view, so, also, that natural conception lies at the foundation of the period given; yet even in this point the natural relation is heightened, as the locusts remain out of the abyss for fully five months, while, naturally, it is only within this time that occasionally a swarm of locusts may come. — *ὁ βασανισμὸς αὐτῶν.* The *αὐτῶν* is the gen. subj., as in the corresponding *ὡς βασαν. σκορπίου.* The subj. again is the *ἀκρίδες*, and *βασανισμός* has an active sense, as the form corresponds.[6] — *ὅταν παίσῃ ἄνθρ.*, when he shall have struck a man.[7] The correct Greek mode of expression regards a case naturally possible as having already occurred. Significant is the expression *παίειν*, which in the LXX., besides *πατάσσειν*,[8] corresponds to the Heb. חִכָּה.[9] The Latins also speak forcibly of the scorpion's stroke.[10]

Ver. 6. *ἐν τ. ἡμέραις ἐκείναις*, viz., when what has been previously seen by John in the vision actually occurs. Just upon the fact that the vision represents prophetically what is to occur,[11] depends the express prophetic mode of expression in the fut. *ζητήσουσιν*, together with the formula *ἐν τ. ἡμ. ἐκείναις*.[12] Not only is the wish described that the wounds inflicted by the locusts might be mortal,[13] but, in general, the despairing desire to see an end made to life, and thus to escape[14] the dreadful tortures,[15] — a terrible counterpart to the *ἐπιθυμία* of the apostle springing from the holiest hope.[16]

Vv. 7–10. Only now, after John has described how he has seen the miraculous locusts rise from the abyss, and what plagues they are to bring,

[1] Züll.
[2] Hofmann.
[3] Ebrard.
[4] Cf. already Calov., Vitr., etc.
[5] Cf. Bochart, *Hieroz.* ii. 495.
[6] De Wette.
[7] Cf. Winer, p. 289.
[8] Jon. iv. 7.
[9] Num. xxii. 28; 2 Sam. xiv. 6.
[10] Plin., *H. N.*, vi. 28.
[11] Cf. iv. 1, v. 1 sqq.
[12] Cf. Ewald, De Wette.
[13] De Wette.
[14] Cf. Jer. viii. 3.
[15] Ver. 5.
[16] Phil. i. 23.

does he proceed to describe the extraordinary phenomenon more minutely and fully. An essential feature in this description, ver. 10, has express reference to what is said in vv. 3–5: in other respects the individual points of the description are not to be urged, as the context itself not only does not suggest a special interpretation, which must prove allegorical, but rather excludes it; e.g., there is no question as to something special according to ver. 3 sqq., either as to the teeth of lions, or the hair of women. The infernal locusts are to torment men only after the manner of scorpions (ver. 10); of a biting, as with the teeth of lions, nothing whatever is said. But if individual features be pressed in violation of the context, manifest preposterous interpretations follow; as, e.g., the reference of the teeth of lions to the erroneous doctrines and calumniations with which heretics have lacerated the orthodox church.[1] That which is aimed at is the general impression in a description, in which the actual form of natural locusts lies, in a certain way, at the foundation. These infernal locusts, however dreadful their supernatural form, are nevertheless always to be known as locusts; only in what is described in ver. 10, they have a wonderful peculiarity of their form corresponding to the plagues committed to them (ver. 3 sqq.), which is without all natural analogy. — *τὰ ὁμοιώματα τῶν ακρ.* Incorrectly, Hengstenb. and Ew. ii.: their likeness. *ὁμοίωμα* designates regularly[2] the product of an *ὁμοιοῦν*, i e, the form so far as it is just like a model.[3] The forms of the locusts were like *ἵπποις ἡτοιμ. εἰς πόλ.* This pertains to the forms as a whole. Cf. Joel ii. 4. In books of travel, it is expressly noted, that the form of the locust has a certain resemblance to that of a horse.[4] The similarity is especially manifest if we think of the horse as equipped (*ἡτοιμασμ. εἰς πολ.*), so that its head rises from the breastplate like the head of the locust from its thorax (ver. 9). — *ἐπὶ τ. κερ. αὐτ. ὡς στέφανοι ὅμοιοι χρυσῷ.* From the fact that the natural locust has nothing on its head that looks like a crown, it does not follow that the *στεφάνοι ὅμ. χρ.* are nothing else than the polished helmets of soldiers, who are to be understood under the allegory of locusts.[5] *Στέφ.* does not mean helmets; and even if there were some ground, in general, for such allegory, yet, at all events, the individual features of the allegory as such could first be harmoniously comprehended, and afterwards be obtained in their individual points. But any mingling of (assumed) allegory and literal statement is to be rejected; and hence the exposition is entirely inadmissible which ascribes helmets, meant literally, to locusts, meant allegorically. The same fundamental principle applies to the other features of the description; so that, e.g., the hair, like the hair of women, ascribed to the locusts, could not be the long hair of barbarian warriors.[6] — The supposition is readily suggested, that also the words *κ. ἐπι τὰς κεφ., κ.τ.λ.*, contain an allusion to the natural form of the locust. But even if John says that upon the heads of the locusts there was something "like gold-like crowns" (*ὡς στ. ὅμοιοι χρ.*, cf. iv. 6), he could scarcely have thought of the two antennae about

Calov., etc. [2] Cf. Winer, p. 89. [3] Cf. Ezek. i. 16, x. 21, where the Heb. דְּמוּת stands; Rom. i. 23; Phil. ii. 7. [4] Cf. Winer, *Rwb.*, i. 575. [5] Eichh., Heinr. [6] Against Vitr., etc.

an inch long;[1] it is more probable,[2] that the rather strong, jagged elevation, which of course is situated, not on the head, but in the middle of the thorax,[3] but which in the popular view, not readily distinguishing the line of division between head and thorax, may appear as if upon the head of the insect, serves as the natural type. The yellowish-green brilliant coloring of that elevation of the thorax may then have given John the natural opportunity for describing that which is crown-like on the heads of the demoniacal locusts as ὅμ. χρυσῷ. — τὰ πρόσωπα αὐτ. ὡς πρόσωπα ἀνθρώπων. The expressly marked comparison dare be denied here as little as the other features of the description. Hengstenb , therefore, is incorrect when, like the older allegorists, not only mistaking the simple comparison for an (imaginary) allegory, but also confounding the literal with an allegorical interpretation, he says, "Their faces were like the faces of men, since a fearful look, the dreadful look of men, shines through the look of locusts. In fact, they were actually faces of men." The text nowhere says this, but gives an idea of the faces of the demoniacal locusts by representing them as like the faces of men. This also has its natural foundation in the fact, that the head of the locust has actually a faint resemblance to the human profile.[4] The more strongly this similarity is regarded, as expressed in the supernatural locusts whose entire form has in it something monstrous, the more dreadful must it appear. — καὶ εἶχον τρίχας ὡς τρίχας γυναικῶν. This feature of the description also is to be apprehended in the same way as the preceding. The words ὡς τοίχ. γυν. are intended only relatively; the point of comparison, however, can lie only in the length of the hair, since long hair is peculiar to women, not to men.[5] In the description which is intended only to make visible the fact that the miraculous locusts have long hair like that of women, there is no special allegorical reference, either to the long hair as it is found in barbarian warriors,[6] or to the fact that "the spirits of darkness," or men serving as their instruments, "look so mildly and tenderly from beneath the tresses of women," while back of these locks they conceal the teeth of lions.[7] Every thing upon which such allegorical interpretation must lay importance has been improperly introduced. It may appear doubtful whether John, in representing the wonderfully long hair of the supernatural locusts, thinks of it according to the analogy of the antennae of the natural locusts, — as is most simple, — or whether he understands the hair in the other parts of the body, e.g., the legs;[8] but it is certain, that if the context is otherwise to be regarded as harmonious and free from perplexity, every other reference, except that indicated by the simple comparison, is to be regarded out of place. — κ. οἱ ὀδόντες αὐτ. ὡς λεόντων ἦσαν. Joel already (i. 6) ascribes the teeth of lions to natural locusts. There, as here, nothing else is illustrated but the desolating voraciousness, but not "the rage of the enemy."[9] This feature is highly significant in order to answer to the figure

[1] Ewald.
[2] Cf. Züll., De Wette.
[3] Cf. Winer *in loc.*
[4] Cf. Züll., Ew., De Wette.
[5] Cf. 1 Cor. xi. 14 sq. Winer, *Rwb.*, i. 527.
[6] As even De Wette tries to establish, although properly rejecting the interpretation of the locusts as warriors.
[7] Ebrard.
[8] Ewald.
[9] Hengstenb.

of locusts as such, but, like what is said in ver. 7, is entirely irrelevant in reference to the particular plague which is to be brought by the infernal locusts (ver. 3 sqq.). — κ. εἰχ. θώρακας ὡς θῶρ. σιδηροῦς. Incorrectly, Hengstenb.: "The iron cuirasses show how difficult it is to approach these horsemen." Instead of the breastplate of natural locusts, to which natural history has given the significant name *thorax*,[1] the supernatural locusts have a cuirass compared only with a coat of mail. — κ. ἡ φωνὴ τ. πτερύγων, κ.τ.λ. Like natural, these demoniacal locusts also have wings, whose rushing is very naturally[2] illustrated by the comparison, ὡς φωνὴ ἁρμάτων ἵππων πολλῶν τρεχόντων εἰς πόλεμον. In these words neither the ἁρμάτων[3] nor the ἵππων[4] is to be regarded as interpolated, since the idea "as the sound of chariots of many horses running to war," is as readily understood as it is throughout suitable. Yet it dare not be said, that, while the rattling of the wagons corresponds to the whizzing of the locusts, the horses are specially mentioned, "because the mass of riders, and not of wagons, are the proper antitype of the locusts."[5] Already the expression, in which the ἁρμάτων belongs to ἵππων πολλ. as its subjective genitive, forbids the distinction made in the interests of a perverted (allegorizing) collective view. The *entire* noise, which is caused as well by the chariot-wheels, as also by the hoofs of the horses driven in the chariots, is designated, since it is designedly that not the chariots alone are mentioned. — κ. ἔχουσιν οὐρὰς ὁμοίας σκορπίοις καὶ κέντρα. The *Comparatio compendiaria*[6] states that tails of the locusts are like *the tails* of scorpions; in connection with which, the particular (καὶ κέντρα) is expressly marked, that is the special subject of consideration. Beng., Hengstenb.,[7] are not willing, however, to acknowledge any breviloquence, but regard the locusts' tails as the (entire) scorpions, and appeal to ver. 19. But in the latter passage, where the subject refers to heads and mouths situated in the serpent-like tails of the horses, not only the context in general, but also the special determination ἔχουσ. κεφάλας, forbids us finding in the words ὁμ. ὄφεσιν a *comparatio compendiaria*; while, in ver. 10, the intention and expression lead to this most simple mode of statement. — κ. ἐν τ. οὐραῖς αὐτ. ἡ ἐξουσία αὐτ. ἀδικῆσαι, κ.τ.λ. The inf. ἀδικ. explains the power in the tails furnished with scorpion-like stings.[8] It is worthy of observation, how this last feature again reverts to the description of the same plagues as are commanded in ver. 3 sqq.;[9] and thus the whole appears to be harmoniously rounded off. Also the designation μῆνας πέντε is repeated from ver. 5, in order once more to emphatically mention that the infernal beasts, with their scorpion-like equipment and power, are to plague men after the manner of locusts during five full months. [See Note LVII., p. 292.]

Ver. 11. As in their form and entire nature, the demoniacal locusts are distinguished from those which are natural,[10] also in that they have a king, viz., τὸν ἄγγελον τῆς ἀβύσσου, i.e., not "an angel from the abyss,"[11] but the

[1] De Wette.
[2] Cf. Joel ii. 5. Winer, *Rwb., in loc.*
[3] De Wette.
[4] Ew. i.
[5] Hengstenb.
[6] Cf. xiii. 11; Matt. v. 20.
[7] Cf. also Winer, p. 579; De Wette.
[8] Cf. vi. 8.
[9] Ewald, Hengstenb.
[10] Prov. xxx. 27.
[11] Luth.

angel of the abyss, by which, however, not Satan himself is to be understood;[1] since this is indicated neither by the designation, τ. ἀγγ. τ. ἀβ., nor the definite appellation. Still less is the "king" to be identified with the "star," ver. 1, as Hengstenb.[2] must do, because he assumes that as often as a star is mentioned in the Apoc. a ruler is meant, and therefore says here, "If what is said here were concerning another king, the locusts would have two kings." The expression τὸν ἀγγ. τ. ἀβ.[3] makes us think only of such an angel as is in a special way the overseer of the abyss.[4] One thing, pertaining to this position of his, is here mentioned, viz., that he is the king of the locusts rising from the abyss. As the overseer of the abyss, however, he is not only designated its angel, but bears also the very name which in its Heb. form expressly indicates that relation: ὄνομα αὐτῷ Ἑβραϊστὶ Ἀβαδδὼν καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἑλληνικῇ ὄνομα ἔχει Ἀπολλύων. Already in the O. T., אֲבַדּוֹן (LXX.: ἀπώλεια), parallel with שְׁאוֹל, designates the kingdom of corruption in a local respect;[5] with the rabbins, Abaddon is the lowest space of hell.[6] Accordingly the ἄβυσσος itself receives the name Ἀβ.; but very appropriately the angel of the abyss here bears it, who as overseer is in a certain respect its personal representative. The Greek interpretation Ἀπολλύων is given in this form — not as possibly ὀλοθρευτής, etc., not to give a sound corresponding with the name Apollo,[7] but because in the LXX. the personal name is naturally connected with the expression ἀπώλεια. An express contrast between Apollyon the Destroyer, and Jesus the Saviour, can be found only by those who[8] understand the former as Satan himself. [See Note LVIII., p. 292.]

Ver. 12. These words,[9] serving as well to conclude vv. 1–11 (ἡ οὐαὶ ἡ μία ἀπῆλθεν), as to point to what follows (ἰδοὺ ἔρχεται, κ.τ.λ.) belong to John's report, and are not to be taken as the words of the eagle,[10] or any other heavenly messenger. After the vision just described, John makes prominent that now the one woe of the threefold cry is fulfilled, and accordingly past. — ἡ μία, cardinal number, that one of the three, as immediately afterwards ἔτι δύο. Cf. vi. 1. — ἡ οὐαὶ. The striking feminine form is explained by the fact that the conception of a θλῖψις is involuntarily substituted for this announced woe.[11] — ἰδού, ἔρχεται ἔτι δύο οὐαὶ μ. τ. The sing. ἔρχεται contains an hypallage, which is inoffensive since the verb precedes.[12]

The allegorical mode of interpretation applies to ver. 1 sqq., as everywhere, the most arbitrary expedients, and does the greatest violence to the context, and that, too, alike in the expositors who make their explanations from an overstrained conception of biblical prophecy, no less than in those who in a more or less rationalistic way consider the prophetic visions of John as *vaticinia post eventum*, and transform them into allegorical outlines of the events of the Romano-Judaic war. The plague of locusts is regarded as *heresy* only by interpreters of the first class;[13] as *calamities of war*, and

[1] Ebrard. Cf. Grot., Calov., etc.
[2] Also Volkmar.
[3] Cf. xvi. 5.
[4] Beng., Ew., De Wette.
[5] Cf. Job xxvi. 6, xxviii. 22; and, besides, Hirzel-Olshaus.
[6] Cf. Schöttg.
[7] Grot.
[8] Beng., Hengstenb.
[9] Cf. xi. 14.
[10] Cf. viii. 13.
[11] Cf. Winer, p. 169.
[12] Cf. Winer, p. 481.
[13] Beda, Andr., Areth., N. de Lyra, Luth., Calov., Boss., Stern, etc.

similar afflictions, by interpreters of both classes.[1] N. de Lyra, like many others proposing the Arians, interprets the individual chief features thus: the star, ver. 1, is the Emperor Valens, "who from the height of Catholic faith fell into the Arian heresy;" the key is the power of exalting this heresy; the locusts are the Vandals whom this heresy infected; the verdure, ver. 4, represents the Christians in Africa spared by the Vandals; the five months designate the period of the five Vandal rulers. Stern understands by the locusts all imaginable heretics, down even to the Pantheists and German Catholics of our times. The scorpion-tails indicate that "false doctrine bears its sting in its consequences;" the hair of women admonishes that "many false doctrines, occasioned by inordinate love to women, have almost all been diffused by women, to begin with Helena the associate of Simon Magus, down to the bacchantes of modern times, who, with Ronge and his followers, drank the cup of the Devil, and won admirers for the prophet of Laurahütte."

Many older Protestants understand by the star the Pope; by the locusts the degenerate clergy, viz., the monks of the Catholic Church.[2] This was, as C. a Lap. says, a retaliation for the interpretation of Bellarmin and other Catholics, that it refers to Luther, Calvin, and the Evangelical Church. — If by the locusts warriors are understood (and even Klief. forces from the passage the ideas of military power and its oppression), expositors like Grot., Wetst., Herd., Eichh., Heinr., find a more minute determination derived from the fundamental view of the entire Apoc. The locusts are the Zealots.[3] The star is, according to Grot., Eleasar, the son of Ananias; according to Herd., Manaim. The abyss opened by him is, according to Grot., "the seditious doctrine that obedience must not be rendered the Romans," for (*καὶ*, ver. 3 = *nam*) from this the party of the Zealots arose to the injury of the Jews; according to Herd., "the fortress Masada." Abaddon is, according to Grot., "the spirit which animated those Zealots;" according to Herder, Simon, the son of Gorion. To Vitr. and Beng., chronology suggests a more minute determination; in the time succeeding the fourth events of the trumpet-vision, something must be found to which the fifth trumpet-vision could be referred. Hence Vitr. conjectured the incursions of the Goths into the Western Roman Empire in the beginning of the fifth century; Beng. understood the persecution of the Jews in Persia in the sixth century. Volkm. understands the army of Parthians to be led by Nero against Rome.[4] Without any more minute determination, Hengstenb. interprets the fifth trumpet as referring to the distresses of war, and the locusts to soldiers. "One of the many incarnations of Apollyon" was Napoleon, whose name has a "noteworthy similarity" to the name of the king of the locusts.[5] A special indication will be found in the text, that the locusts are to be understood allegorically. Beda, already, said that such locusts as, according to ver. 4, are to eat neither

[1] Vitr., Beng., Hengstenb., Grot., Wetst., Herd., Eichh.

[2] Aret., Bull., Laun., etc.

[3] According to Wetst., the army of Cestius.

[4] Cf. ver. 14.

[5] Gerken also, who, through an entire series of trifling expedients, puts a forced construction on the name Napoleon, thinks (p. 26) that we may venture to derive it from *ἀπόλλυμι*, and therefore writes it Napolleon.

grass nor leaves, could not be actual locusts, but must be men. But ver. 4 is with more justice understood by other allegorists as a "figurative" mode of expression; as, e.g., by Bengel, who suggests "a lower, middle, and higher class of the sealed." Otherwise N. de Lyra, Vitr., etc. If there be an allegory anywhere, every individual feature must be allegorically interpreted. But for this the text itself nowhere gives the least occasion. It cannot even be said, with De Wette, that what is demoniacal in the plague of locusts here portrayed is only to be conceived of as a symbol of their extreme destructiveness; for however seriously and literally the demoniacal nature of these locusts be intended, it follows that they have no power,[1] even as demoniacal, over the sealed, who remain absolutely untouched[2] by all the other plagues of the trumpet-visions. The plagues of the one vision are just as literally meant as those of the other, the infernal locusts with the tails of scorpions no less than war, famine, the commotion and darkening of the heavenly bodies. For John beholds a long series of various, and, as a whole, definitely shaped plagues, as foretokens and preparations of the proper *parousia*. Whoever, then, as Hebart,[3] expects the literal fulfilment of all these visions, and, consequently, e.g., the actual appearance of the locusts described in ver. 1 sqq., it is true, does more justice to the text than any allegorist; but, because of a mechanical conception of inspiration and prophecy, he ignores the distinction between the actual contents of prophecy, and the poetical form with which the same is invested in the enlightened spirit of the prophet, and not without a beautiful play of his holy fantasy.

Vv. 13–21. The *sixth* trumpet-vision; a wonderful army of horsemen slew the third of men without causing repentance in those who were left. This visitation belongs to the *second* woe.[4]

Vv. 13–15. At a divine command the trumpet-angel looses the four angels bound thus far at the Euphrates, under whose direction the immense army of horsemen is to bring its plagues.

καὶ ἤκουσα, κ.τ.λ. What John hears[5] in the vision, he represents just as what he beheld (ver. 17), in consequence of the trumpet-vision. — φωνὴν μίαν ἐκ τῶν (τεσσάρων) κεράτων τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου, κ.τ.λ. In a linguistic respect it is possible that the precise number is intended indefinitely,[6] so that it is left entirely undecided as to whom the voice belongs, as vi. 6,[7] although it is impossible to take ἐκ in the general sense of ἀπό,[8] and to explain that the voice came from God enthroned back of the altar.[9] Cf., on the other hand, also, xvi. 7. Yet a more definite reference of the μίαν would result in connection with the fact that the voice proceeds from the four horns of the altar. The altar from whose horns the voice proceeds is expressly designated as that mentioned viii. 3 sqq.[10] The circumstance, accordingly, that from its horns the voice proceeds which looseus the plagues described imme-

[1] Ver. 4.
[2] Cf. vii. 1 sqq.
[3] Die Zweite Sichtbare Zukunft Christi, Erl., 1850.
[4] Cf. xi. 14.
[5] Cf. vi. 3, 5, 7, 10.
[6] "A voice." Ewald. Cf. viii. 13. Winer, p. 111.
[7] De Wette.
[8] "Forth from," like the Heb. מִן, which includes the meaning of both prepositions.
[9] Ew. l., Stern.
[10] And vi. 9 sqq.

diately afterwards, must have a similar meaning as the circumstance in viii. 5, that the fire cast upon the earth was taken from the same altar, i.e., the command of the angels to loose appears as a consequence of the prayers presented at the altar;[1] but after that, it is proper to understand the *one* (Divine) voice making manifest this special hearing of prayer, in contrast with the many voices of those who pray, heard and referred to also in viii. 3 (τ. προσευχ. τῶν ἁγ.). — It is a perversion, however, to consider the *one* voice in any special relation to the *four* horns of the altar; for, even apart from the critical uncertainty of the reading τεσσάρων, the sense forced from it[2] is extremely feeble, while the allegorical[3] explanation[4] is without any support. Also the relation, which is in itself arbitrary, between the four horns and the "four sins," ver. 21, and likewise the four angels,[5] falls with the spurious τεσσάρων. — τῷ ἕκτῳ ἀγγ. From the fact that here the trumpet-angel not only sounds the trumpet, but is himself engaged in the act which follows, the inference dare in no wise be drawn that the same relation occurs also in other passages where it is not explicitly stated.[6] But if the question be asked why there is ascribed here[7] to the proclaimer of the plagues a co-operation with them, any reference to "economy of means"[8] affords no satisfactory answer; for why this economy just here, which nevertheless does not universally prevail? As a reason lying in the subject itself is not perceptible, it appears to be adopted only to avoid a barren uniformity, which would occur if the same angel who (viii. 5) cast the fire from the altar to the earth, or even if a new angel, who yet would have substantially the same position with that of the trumpet-angels, received now the command to loose the four angels at the Euphrates. — Λῦσον — Εὐφράτῃ. The article τοὺς τέσσ. ἀγγ. has its definite reference, as viii. 2, to the following τοὺς δεδ., κ.τ.λ.,[9] but throughout does not indicate the identity, adopted by Beda, etc., of the angel here named with that mentioned in vii. 1 sqq. That the four angels are *wicked* angels,[10] not good,[11] also not "corruptible," — as De Wette and Ebrard say, when they uncertainly remark that we must not think directly of wicked angels, — is to be derived from their being bound,[12] from their position on the Euphrates, and from the fact that they lead an army of an infernal kind, in which respect they are to be compared with the star which

[1] Cf. Hofm., De Wette, Bleek, Hengstenb., Ebrard, Klief.

[2] "That these four horns gave forth simultaneously, not a diverse, but one and the same voice" (Vitr., Hengstenb.).

[3] If it be considered that Beda, who does *not* have the "four" in his text, yet explains "the horns, the Gospels projecting from the Church," the conjecture is readily made that the number *ten* was inserted in the interests of this allegorizing interpretation.

[4] "It indicates the harmonious preaching of the one Church, or the one faith, from the Four Gospels" (Zeger. Cf. also Calov, etc.). Or, according to Grot., who understands by the voices, "the prayers of exiles beseeching that they may return at some time to their ancestral abodes," "*all places* to which the Jews sent into exile the worshippers of Christ."

[5] Hengstenb. Cf. also Beng., Züll., Hofm.

[6] Against Beng.

[7] Cf. xvii. 1.

[8] De Wette.

[9] Ebrard.

[10] Beda, Bengel, Ebrard, etc.

[11] Boss., Hengstenb.

[12] For the explanation of Bossuet, "What binds the angels is the supreme command of God," which Hengstenb. adopts, is a spiritualistic subtilization that, besides, has no sense at all if Hengstenb. explains away the concrete idea of angel itself by the interpretation that in the angels the truth is embodied, that the bands of warriors led by them only act when they are sent.

fell from heaven, ver. 1, as well as with the angel of the abyss, the king of the locusts, ver. 11. — The number *four* of the angels does not correspond to the four parts of the army led by them,[1] for of this the text says nothing,[2] but indicates[3] that the army is to be led on all four sides of the earth, in order to slay[4] the third of all men.[5] Ebrard, in the interests of his allegorical explanation, emphasizes the number four of the angels leading the army, ver. 16 sqq., in contrast with the *one* king of the locusts, ver. 11. Thus in the one case there is a monarchical and in the other a democratical constitution; with which it also harmonizes, that in ver. 17 nothing is said of crowns as in ver. 7. Nevertheless, Ebrard does not expect the elucidation of the sixth as well as of the fifth trumpet-vision until its future fulfilment: the "spiritual mercenary hosts of superstition" are only foretokens of the still impending plagues. [See Note LIX., p. 293.] ἐπὶ τῷ ποταμῷ τῷ μεγάλῳ Εὐφράτῃ. This local designation has been received literally;[6] and the application has been made, that the Parthian armies, so perilous to the Romans, mentioned in ver. 16 sqq., came from the neighborhood of the Euphrates,[7] or it is said that the Roman legions indicated in ver. 16 sqq. moved from the Euphrates against Jerusalem.[8] The latter is without any truth;[9] Grot. already was therefore compelled to explain: The armies of the Roman commanders, i.e., the four angels, extended to the Euphrates![10] But it is a valid objection to the view of Ewald, as well as that of Herder,[11] that the armies portrayed in ver. 16 sqq. are by no means human armies, but just as certainly of a supernatural kind, as the locusts of ver. 1 sqq., in their way. If the language of ver. 16 sqq., concerning actual martial bands, were to be interpreted therefore allegorically, Vitr., Beng., and many older expositors would be justified, who understood the army (16 sqq.) of the Tartars and Turks, and likewise, in connection with this, took the mention of the Euphrates in its proper geographical sense. But, unless we charge John with great confusion, we dare not say that "the bound angels" are allegorical, — Parthian,[12] Roman commanders,[13] or Turkish caliphs,[14] — the "Euphrates" on which they are bound literal, and the troops led by them again allegorical. Such confused inconsistency the purely allegorical explanation indeed avoids; but it also appears here so untenable and visionary, that, as it itself rests on no foundation, it offers no point whatever where it can be met by a definite counter argument. Wetst. says that the Euphrates is the Tiber, just as Babylon, ch. xiv. sqq., is Rome;[15] but in that passage it is explained, in the text itself, as to how Babylon is meant, while here nothing whatever concerning Babylon is said. With entire indefiniteness, Beda:

[1] Ewald.

[2] Ew. ii. refers entirely to various nations which must have rendered military service in the Parthian army. Cf. Dan. vii. 4; Epiphan. (*Haer.* li. 34), who mentions Assyrians, Babylonians, Medes, and Persians.

[3] Cf. vii. 1.

[4] Cf. De Wette, Hengstenb.

[5] Vv. 15, 18.

[6] Cf. xvi. 12.

[7] Ewald. Cf. also De Wette, Rinck, Volkm.

[8] Herder. Cf. Grot., Eichh., etc.

[9] Cf. Tacit., *Hist.*, v. 1.

[10] "Ingentes exercitus ad E. usque pertingebant."

[11] Cf. also Bleek.

[12] Ew. i. [13] Herd.

[14] Beng.

[15] Cf. N. de Lyra: "The Euphrates is the Roman Empire."

"The power of the worldly kingdom, and the waves of persecutors." — The context itself offers the correct conception, by recalling in the formal expression τ. ποταμῷ τῷ μεγάλῳ Εὐφρ.[1] the O. T.;[2] combining with this local designation, to be comprehended from the O. T. history, the description of an army whose dreadfulness far surpasses every thing of a human character, and actual historical experience, but, besides, has an allegorical meaning as little as the locusts, ver. 1 sqq. The mention of the Euphrates is *schematical;* i.e., John designates with concrete definiteness the district whence the supernatural army-plague is to traverse the world, by naming the precise region whence, in O. T. times, the divinely sent plagues of Assyrian armies came upon Israel.[3] An entirely similar schematical sense would have occurred if John had called the place whence the locusts went forth, Egypt. That the Euphrates is the boundary of the land of Abraham[4] and David,[5] is to be urged here as little as that it was the boundary of the Roman Empire;[6] the only matter of consequence is, that from the Euphrates formerly "the scourges of God" proceeded.[7] It is also irrelevant to this schematical idea, that the subject of consideration is now a plague for all men, while previously the scourges of God were sent against Israel: the mode of view of the writer of the Apocalypse is only indicated as rooted in the O. T., in the fact that this concrete local designation appears before his gazing eyes. [See Note LX., p. 293.] ἡτοιμασμένοι. Cf. viii. 6, where also ἵνα follows. They were already prepared; only, up to the present, the bands held them In ver. 16, therefore, the description of the army breaking forth under their command directly follows; the released angels immediately put themselves in motion with their armies. — εἰς τὴν ὥραν — καὶ ἐνιαυτόν. Although the gender of the nouns is different,[8] the art. is placed only before the first, not only because it combines in general the common conception of time, but also the close inner relation and determination of the individual conceptions to one another and through one another affords the idea of essential unity. For the expression, ascending from the hour to the year,[9] shows that the fixed hour occurs in the fixed day, the day in the fixed month, etc.[10] Incorrectly, Luther: "for an hour," etc. Just as incorrectly, Bengel: Since the art. occurs only once, a continuous period of time is indicated, — which, as a prophetic hour contains about eight ordinary days, and a prophetic day an ordinary half-year, he reckons as about two hundred and seven years, and understands it of the times of the Turk (634–840 A.D.). — τὸ τρίτον τῶν ἀνθρ. Men, in reference to whose torment (ver. 1 sqq.) nothing was said of a third (cf. ver. 4), are now slain by the sixth trumpet-plague in the same proportion as previously trees, ships, etc., were destroyed.[11]

Vv. 16-19. Description of the army led by the four released angels; its immense size, ver. 16; its supernatural nature, and terrible effect (vv. 17–

[1] Cf. Gen. xv. 18; Deut. i. 7; Jos. i. 4.
[2] De Wette, Züll., Hofm., Hengstenb.
[3] Isa. vii. 20. Cf. viii. 7; Jer. xlvi. 10. Hengstenb. Cf. Primas, Züll.
[4] Hofm.
[5] Züll.
[6] De Wette.
[7] Hengstenb.
[8] Cf. Winer, p. 120.
[9] Cf. Num. i. 4; Zech. i. 7; Hag. i. 15. Hengstenb.
[10] De Wette, Hengstenb., Ebrard.
[11] Cf. viii. 7, 9, 11, 12.

19). — *τοῦ ἵππου.* The explanatory variations *τοῦ ἱππικοῦ* and *τῶν ἵππων* arose from the offence taken because John did not write, in accordance with classical usage, *τῆς ἵππου.* — *δισμυριάδες μυριάδων*; i.e., two hundred millions. — *ἤκουσα, κ.τ.λ.*, is added by asyndeton, since an explanation is necessary as to whence it was that John knew of the immense number.[1] Beda, who prefers to render the Greek expression by "*bis myriades myridaum*," than with the Vulg., "*vicies millies dena millia*," finds here "a deceitful *duplicity* of the perverse army." Beng. thinks that the Turkish army could readily have reached that number; viz., in the course of the entire two hundred and seven years of their dominion (cf. ver. 15). Hengstenb. recognizes the unnaturalness of the number, and concludes thence that it is meant allegorically; it is to be ascribed to no particular war, but to "the class personified," as in all the preceding trumpet-visions. But since the army itself, ver. 17 sqq., is not described allegorically, the number can be allegorical as little as the local designation, ver. 14: but this number is likewise schematical;[1] i.e., the army, which is on all occasions beheld as definite, individual, and supernatural in its entire character, appears also in a concrete but supernatural numerical quantity. An allusion to Ps. lxviii. 18 may be regarded as the substratum of the concrete number here presented to the prophet in his vision. [See Note LXI., p. 293.] That John, when he now wishes to describe the horses and riders seen by him (*καὶ οὕτως εἶδον, κ.τ.λ.*), adds explicitly *ἐν τῇ ὁράσει* to the *εἶδον τ. ἵππ.*, can occasion surprise only as this formula, ordinarily employed by the ancient prophets,[2] does not occur more frequently in the Apoc.; but from the fact that it is nowhere found except in this passage, although it could stand everywhere with the *εἶδον* indicating a prophetic *ὅρασις*, nothing less follows than that the present vision has an allegorical meaning, as Beng. and Hengstenb.[3] affirm; the latter of whom, spiritualizing throughout, says, "In the vision every thing is *seen;* that which is inner must imprint itself on what is outward, the spiritual must assume a body;" and thus in the color of the breastplate, described immediately afterwards, he sees only a "pictorial expression" of the murderous spirit of the soldiers, who are to be understood literally. But even granting that the idea of vision here presupposed were correct, the *εἶδον*, in itself, would here, as everywhere, point to this allegorizing. For, why should we find just here the express addition *ἐν τῇ ὁράσει*? In it, no intention whatever is to be perceived, and least of all, that of giving an exegetical hint: it is possible, therefore, that John here added the *ἐν τῇ ὁράσει* to his *εἶδον* involuntarily, because, in the sixth trumpet-vision, what has thus far been advanced is what he has heard, while he now intends to describe the forms as they appeared to him in the vision. — The first part of the description, *ἔχοντας θώρακας — θειώδεις*, is referred by Beng., Ewald, De Wette, Hengstenb., Bleek, only to *τοὺς καθημένους ἐπ' αὐτ.*, as if the description of the horses were given uninterruptedly and completely, only after that of the riders had been given more incidentally. But Züll. and Ebrard have more correctly referred the

[1] Cf. vii. 4.

[2] Cf. Dan. viii. 2, ix. 21.

[3] Klief. also, who explains (p. 152) the troops of riders identical with the "worldly war-power" described in vv. 1–12, which now proceeds to slay men.

ἔχοντας, κ.τ.λ., to the horses and the riders; for it is the more improbable that the first feature of the description, which is expressly stated to be a description of the horses, should not apply to them, as the color of the breastplates has a correspondence with the things proceeding from the mouths of the horses. In general, the treatment is not concerning the riders, but the horses; so that the words καὶ τ. καθημ. ἐπ' αὐτ. contain only what is incidental, and in no way hinder the reference of ἔχ. θώρ., κ.τ.λ., to τ. ἵππους. — θώρακας πυρίνους, κ.τ.λ. The πυρινους and the θειώδεις designate, just as the ὑακίνθινους, only the *color*;[1] and, besides, there are three colors to be regarded in their particularity, because they correspond to the three things coming from the mouths of the horses.[2] The ὑακινθίνους, which designates dark red,[3] corresponds excellently with the succeeding καπνος. — καὶ αἱ κεφ., κ.τ.λ. The heads of the horses were *like* the heads of lions, possibly similar to lion heads in the size of the mouths and the length of the manes;[4] it is a definite, monstrous appearance, that is represented, and not in general that the heads of the horses are "fierce and terrible,"[5] which, of course, is suited better to the allegorical explanation. — κ. ἐκ τ. στομάτων, κ.τ.λ. How seriously the description is meant, may be inferred from the fact, that in ver. 18 the fire, the smoke, and the sulphur, proceeding from the mouths of the horses, are expressly designated as the three plagues whereby[6] these armies are to slay men, just as the locusts tormented them with their scorpion stings. Fire, smoke, and sulphur — of which the latter, according to the analogy of xxi. 8, xiv. 10, xix. 20, indicates the infernal nature of the plagues[7] — are as little intended to be allegorical as, e.g., the famine or the killing in the seal-visions.[8] The allegorical interpretation, therefore, manifests also here the most singularly arbitrary expedients. They who understand the whole of heretics interpret the fire as "the desire for injuring;" the smoke, as "the seeming zeal of faith," because smoke is blue like the heavens; the sulphur, as "the deformity of vices."[9] Similar is the interpretation in Aret., Luther, Calov., etc., who think, it is true, of the Turks, but have especially in view their erroneous doctrine. What proceeds from the mouths of the horses is, according to Calov., properly the Koran, which comprehends within itself "sulphurous lust, the smoke of false doctrines, and the fires of wars." To expositors who understand the armies, ver. 16 sqq., of actual soldiers, — even

[1] Against Züll., who understands a breastplate of copper, blue steel, and brass. Cf. also Eichh., who thinks of an iron and bronze breastplate polished and shining in the sunlight. Still more inaptly, Heinr.: πυρ. is truly fiery; ὑακινθ. signifies polished steel; θειωδ., exhaling a sulphurous odor.

[2] Against Ewald: "Regard therefore the red, shining, and glowing colors brought together in order to denote the height of brilliancy."

[3] See the lexicons.

[4] Ewald.

[5] Beng., Hengstenb.

[6] ἀπὸ. Cf. Winer, p. 348.

[7] Hengstenb.

[8] The classical myth, in accordance with which Ovid (*Met.*, vii. 104 sq.) writes: —

"Ecce, adamanteis vulcanum naribus efflant
Acripedes tauri, tactaeque vaporibus herbae
Ardent."

["So the brazen-footed oxen breathe fire from their adamantine nostrils, and the grass touched by the vapors glows"], (cf. Virg., *Georg.* ii. 140: "Tauri spirantes naribus ignem," "Oxen breathing fire from their nostrils"), may be compared, as it expresses with all seriousness that those oxen were actually fire-breathing.

[9] N. de Lyra. Cf. also Ebrard.

notwithstanding the fact that what is said in the text refers not to horsemen, the supposed "cavalrymen," so much as to the horses, — nothing is readier than to ascribe the fire, smoke, and sulphur, to fiery missiles. Much more correctly, therefore, from the standpoint of the allegory, did, e.g., Grotius understand the firebrands cast into Jerusalem,[1] than Hengstenb., who understands "the fierce animosity, the spirit of murder, and lust for destruction," described by personification as soldiers; after the example of Bengel, who only is unwilling to think of cannon and powder-smoke, because the followers of Mohammed did not, as yet, possess such implements of war. — *ἡ γὰρ ἐξουσία, κ.τ.λ.* Cf. vv. 3, 10. With reference to ver. 18, it is especially emphasized, that the proper power of the horses lies in their mouths; besides this, a second point is added, *καὶ ἐν ταῖς οὐραῖς αὐτων.* But in how far there is also in the tails an *ἐξουσία*, is explained (*γὰρ*) · *αἱ γὰρ οὐραὶ αὐτῶν ὁμοιαι ὄφεσιν, κ.τ.λ.* The tails of the horses are, therefore, serpent-like,[2] especially because these tails have heads; so that they are such as to do injury (*ἐν αὐταῖς*, sc., *οὐραις, ἀδικ.*). It is entirely inapplicable to explain this feature in the description of the monstrous horses, from the analogy of the ancient fiction[3] concerning the so-called *ἀμφίσβαινα* (i.e., the serpent moving forwards and backwards) with two heads;[4] since here nothing whatever is said of two-headed serpents, but instead of the usual horse-tail, something in serpent form, viz., which has a serpent's head, is presented. — Hengstenb.[5] finds here the "malignity" of war symbolized. But why should Bengel be mistaken, who explains that the horsemen (the Turks), even when they turn their backs and seem to flee, do injury? Or is it not still more consistent when Grot. mentions, with reference to this, that with the ancients infantry frequently sat back of the cavalry? Volkm., without seeming to exercise the best judgment, is satisfied with referring this to the kicking-back of the horses.

Ver. 20 sq. The plagues that have been introduced cause no repentance in the survivors.[6] — *οἱ λοιποὶ τ. ἀνθρ.* The contextual reference to ver. 18 is yet expressly marked: *οἳ οὐκ ἀπεκτ. ἐν τ. πληγ. ταύτ.* As the *ἐκ* is meant to limit the *οὐ μετενόησαν*, the final clause, *ἵνα μὴ, κ.τ.λ.*,[7] is explained: they repented not of the works of their hands, in order not (any more) to worship, etc. The *μετανοεῖν ἐκ τ. ἔργ. τ. χειρ. αὐτ.* would have as its intention the ceasing henceforth the *προσκυνεῖν, κ.τ.λ.* But by the words *ἵνα μὴ προσκ., κ.τ.λ.*, not only is the pregnancy of the clause *μεταν. ἐκ τ. ἔργων τ. χειρ. αὐτ.*, which in itself is readily intelligible, explained, but an authentic interpretation is also given to the expression *τ. ἔργ. τ. χειρ. αὐτ.*, which it is here impossible to designate as the entire course of life,[8] — which by no means follows from ii. 22, xvi. 11, since there the characteristic *τῶν χειρῶν αὐτ.* is lacking, — but just as Acts vii. 41, in connection with O. T. passages like Deut. iv. 28, Ps. cxxxv. 15 sqq., must designate idols made with their own hands.[9] It is, indeed,

[1] "They seemed to proceed from the mouth of the horses, because they flew from before their mouths."

[2] See on ver. 10.

[3] Wetst., Beng., Herd., Ew., etc.

[4] Plin., *H. N.*, viii. 35: "The double head of the *amphisbaenae*, i.e., also at the tail."

[5] Cf. also Stern, Ebrard.

[6] Cf. xvi. 11.

[7] Cf. Winer, p. 428.

[8] "All the deeds of life" (Ewald, De Wette, Ebrard).

[9] Beng., Hengstenb.; also Ew. ii.

to be observed, that not only the expression τ. ἔργ. τ. χειρ. αὐτ. in itself, but also the allusion to the material whence human hands have fashioned the idols, and to their blindness and dumbness, refer to O. T. descriptions. But that the discourse is first in general concerning "the works of men's hands," and that then a more minute presentation follows (ἵνα μὴ προσκ., κ.τ.λ.), contains what is objectionable as little as the directly opposite order of Acts vii. 41. — τὰ δαιμόνια. Cf. 1 Cor. x. 20. Bengel suffers here a peculiar embarrassment, because he regards "the rest of men" especially as "so-called Christians," and then must give the explanation as to how far they worshipped devils. But he knows how to help himself. Notwithstanding the incursions of the Turks, he says that the Christians of that time retained the worship of images and of saints; and now there might be many among the worshipping saints who abode not in heaven, but in hell. — καὶ οὐ μετεν. The repetition is necessary, because the former οὐ μετεν., ver. 20, is already too remote to admit of a connection[1] with what follows in ver. 21 (ἐκ τ. φόνων, κ.τ.λ.), but is entirely irrelevant for the more detailed explanation of the whole text.[2] Concerning the sequence of the particles οὐ, οὔτε, οὔτε, cf. Winer, p. 457. — φαρμακειῶν. Sorceries, xviii. 23.[3] Ebrard understands it symbolically of "seductive enchantments." He reaches this conclusion, because in ver. 20 he finds sins against God; in ver. 21, sins against one's neighbor, while actual sorcery, as a sin against God, does not belong in ver. 21.[4] But the established linguistic usage suits no arbitrary dispositions. It is also to be stated against those who have regarded the φαρμακ. in a certain combination with the preceding φόνων,[5] or with the succeeding πορνείας,[6] that the very generally expressed idea of sorcery, — the plural also should be observed, — according to its nature, does not admit of a more specific determination, as the text itself does not give such. — τῆς πορνείας αὐτ. The sing. designates all the particular forms of manifestation[7] of the always same kind of sins. Beng. says appropriately: "Other crimes are committed by men at intervals; πορνεία alone is perpetual with those who are destitute of purity of heart." — The entire description of sins, vv. 20, 21, which is to be comprehended in its unity, is manifestly directed to essentially heathenish godlessness, so that they of whom the third are killed, and two-thirds survive but are not converted, are to be regarded essentially as heathen.[8] [See Note LXII., p. 294] It is the mass of the κατοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς,[9] in contrast with the sealed.[10] From the fact that the latter are not affected by the plague of the sixth trumpet, it is to be inferred, according to the standard of ver. 4, that the armies in this vision, like the locusts of the fifth trumpet, are of a demoniacal kind.

[1] Ewald, etc.

[2] Possibly as a designation of ἔργ. τ. χειρ. αὐτ. (ver. 20), or a classification of sins.

[3] Cf. Meyer on Gal. v. 20.

[4] Cf. also Hengstenb., who, besides, notes the ten sins against the first table (ver. 20)? and the four sins against the second table.

[5] Hengstenb.

[6] Ewald.

[7] Cf. 1 Cor. vii. 2.

[8] Cf. De Wette, etc.

[9] Cf. vi. 10.

[10] Cf. vii. 1 sqq.

Notes by the American Editor.

LVI. Ver. 1. τῆς ἀβύσσου.

Cf. Gebhardt: "These expressions are based upon rabbinical representations, originating from such O. T. statements as Ps. lxxxi. 20, cvii. 26; Isa. xiv. 15 (cf. Isa. v. 14, xxx. 33), according to which there is under the earth an abyss or bottomless pit, with a lake or sea in which brimstone and fire seethe together. From this abyss goes a channel with a mouth, after the manner of a cistern, a narrow passage, as from a scarcely visible spring, to the surface of the earth. This pit, like an ordinary cistern, can be opened and closed, or sealed. . . . The abyss in its signification is a perfect antithesis to heaven. The latter is an invisible, but real, ideal world, which one day with the new heavens and the new earth, and the new Jerusalem, will become a visible reality. So also the former is the invisible, but real, world of the anti-ideal and the ungodly, which will also become a visible (cf. ch. xiv. 10) reality in the lake of fire and brimstone, with its torment and its smoke which ascends for ever and ever; just as the new Jerusalem is now in heaven, so the lake of fire and brimstone is now in the abyss." Cremer: "It is just this antithesis to heaven that makes ἄβυσσος a synonym for ᾅδης, wherein that remoteness from heaven which is distinctive of Hades finds full expression. In Rev. ix. 1, 2, τὸ φρέαρ τῆς ἀβύσσου (xx. 1) appears as the receptacle and prison of destructive powers, over which reigns ὁ ἄγγελος τῆς ἀβύσσου (ix. 11); cf. the petition of the demons (Luke viii. 31). In Rev. xvii. 8, xi. 7, ἀναβαίνειν ἐκ τῆς ἀβύσσου is said of the beast (xiii. 18)."

LVII. Vv. 7–10.

For a very full and condensed statement of the devastations caused by locusts, and their peculiarities, in which some of the features here detailed appear, see Pusey on Joel ii. The significance of the individual features is thus briefly interpreted by Luthardt: "At the basis of the description, there lies, for the most part, reality; but it is increased to what is monstrous and terrible. 'On their heads, as it were crowns of gold;' i.e., they are mighty powers. 'Their faces were as the faces of men;' i.e., they are intellectual beings, intelligences. 'They had hair as the hair of women;' i.e., they are seductive powers. 'Their teeth were as the teeth of lions;' i.e., back of their seductive appearance is inevitable destruction. Cf. Joel i. 6. 'They had breastplates, as it were breastplates of iron;' i.e., they are unassailable. 'The sound of their wings was as the sound of chariots of many horses running to battle;' i.e., they rush like military squadrons irresistibly. Cf. Joel ii. 5. 'Tails like unto scorpions;' i.e., malicious force inflicting injury backwards."

LVIII. Ver. 11. Ἀβαδδών.

Alford: "It is a question who this angel of the abyss is. Perhaps, for accurate distinction's sake, we must not identify him with Satan himself (cf. ch. xii. 3, 9), but must regard him as one of the principal of the bad angels." Weiss (*Bib. Theol. of N. T.*, ii. 270 sq.): "He [sc., Satan] seduced a portion of the angels, who are also (i. 20) symbolized by stars, to fall away from God,

so that they are now designated as his angels. It is such a Satan-angel who is the star fallen from heaven (ix. 1), who lets loose the plague of locusts from the abyss over the inhabitants of the earth, and is expressly designated (ver. 11) as the angel of the abyss, Abaddon or Apollyon." Luthardt emphasizes the contrast which Düsterdieck rejects, and closely follows Hengstenberg: "The angel of the abyss, i.e., Satan. Between him and the Saviour the choice of the world is divided. He who will not have the latter as Lord must have the former, who is hereafter to attain still greater power on earth than now; cf. 2 Thess. ii. 11, 12." Beck objects to the identification of the angel and the star, on the ground that the latter was only "an astronomico-physical phenomenon." But to what, then, does the *αὐτῷ* of ver. 1 refer?

LIX. Ver. 14. *τοὺς τέσσαρας ἀγγέλους.*

Hengstenberg accounts for the number "four" as indicating the "all-sidedness," "the œcumenical character, of the Divine judgment." Alford: "The question need not perplex us here, whether these are good or bad angels; for it does not enter in any way into consideration. They simply appear, as in other parts of this book, as ministers of the Divine purposes, and pass out of view as soon as mentioned."

LX. Ver. 14. *τῷ ποταμῷ τῷ μεγάλῳ Εὐφράτῃ.*

Alford remarks, on Düst.'s opinion that if we take the Euphrates literally, and the rest mystically, endless confusion would be introduced: "This is quite a mistake, as the slightest consideration will show. It is a common feature of Scripture allegory to intermingle with its mystic language literal designations of time and place. Take, for instance, the allegory in Ps. lxxx. 8, 11: 'Thou hast brought a vine out of Egypt. . . . She sent out her boughs unto the sea, and her branches unto the river;' where, though the vine and her boughs and branches are mystical, Egypt, the sea, and the river are all literal." Nevertheless, the position of Hengstenb., concurring with that of Düsterdieck, seems correct: "The local designation is only a seeming one. The Euphrates belongs no less to the vision, which loves to take, as the substratum of its views, events in the past agreeing in character (cf. Isa. xi. 15, 16; Zech. x. 11), e.g., the four angels there bound. Every historical interpretation, as, e.g., the reference to the Euphrates as the boundary of the Roman Empire, and to the dangers which threatened the Romans from the Parthians, apart from the mistake, in general, as to the meaning of the trumpets, is excluded by the immense number in ver. 16. What is said in vv. 20, 21, is not concerning the Romans, but concerning men."

LXI. Ver. 16. *δισμυριάδες μυριάδων.*

Beck interprets the number literally, and explains it by colossal military expeditions and wars to occur throughout the whole world, as intimated by vv. 15, 18, *τὸ τρίτον τῶν ἀνθρώπων*, and ver. 20, *οἱ λοιποὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων*: "a universal war involving all races of men, analogous to the migrations of nations, the first appearance of Mohammedanism, the Crusades," and illustrates its probability by referring to the now estimated one thousand millions of the earth's inhabitants.

LXII. Ver. 21. *ἐκ τῶν φόνων, κ.τ.λ.*

Luthardt: "These are the chief sins of heathenism. Such moral corruption will occur at the end, in spite of advanced culture; for culture of itself does not promote morality, but, as history teaches, may be employed as well in the service of ungodliness and immorality." Calov., in harmony with his scheme of interpretation, refers all these crimes to the Papal antichrist.

CHAPTER X.

Ver. 1. *ἄλλον* before *ἀγγ.* (A, C, ℵ, Vulg., Elz., Beng., Griesb., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]) is omitted in a number of minusc., MSS., and deleted by Matth.; the transposition *ἀγγ. ἄλλον* (16, Primas) also occurs; both upon the ground that in what precedes, either no angel, or at least no "mighty" angel, can be found to whom the one here mentioned may be compared. Cf. De Wette. *ἡ ἶρις.* The art. lacking in Elz. is entirely certain (A, C, ℵ, minusc., Beng., Griesb., etc.). *ἐπὶ τὴν κεφ.* So A, C, Treg., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]. The gen. *τῆς κεφ.* (Elz., Beng., Griesb., Matth.) is a modification supported only by ℵ. On the other hand, in the Elz. edition (ver. 2) the acc. *τὴν θάλ., τὴν γ.*, occurs instead of the original gen. — Ver. 2. *καὶ ἔχων.* Thus, already, Griesb. in accordance with decisive witnesses, instead of the modification *καὶ εἶχεν* (Elz.). — Ver. 4. The interpretation *ὅσα* in ℵ (*quae*, Primas), instead of *ὅτε*, concurs in testimony against the addition *τὰς φωνὰς ἑαυτῶν* in Elz. — *αὐτὰ*: A, C, ℵ, Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]. Without witnesses: *ταῦτα* (Elz.). — Ver. 6. The omission of the words *καὶ τ. θάλ. κ. τὰ ἐν αὐτῃ* in A, ℵ′, depends upon an easily explained oversight. They belong to the completeness of the formal discourse, and are sufficiently defended by C, Vulg., etc. Lach. has parenthesized them. *οὐκέτι ἔσται.* So A, C, al., Griesb., etc. Incorrectly, Elz.: *οὐκ ἔσται ἔτι.* — Ver. 7. *τοὺς ἑαυτ. δούλους προφ.* A, C, ℵ, al. (Matth., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]) assure the acc. The dat. (Elz., Beng.) is a modification. — Ver. 8. *λαλοῦσαν* — *λέγουσαν.* A, C, ℵ, 7, 14, Vulg., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]. The unauthorized nom. is a modification (Elz., Beng., Griesb., Matth.). *τοῦ ἀγγε.* The art. is received already by Griesb., according to decisive witnesses in the Elz. text. — Ver. 11. *καὶ λέγουσίν μοι.* A, 8, 9, 13, al., Areth. (cf. also Vulg.), Matth., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]. The sing. *λέγει* (Elz., Beng., Griesb.) is modifying. ℵ has, besides the plural, several interpretations.

It is manifest that in ch. x. an interlude begins, which occurs here between the sixth (finished in ix. 21) and seventh (beginning in xi. 15) trumpet-visions, just as the scene interposed in ch. vii. between the sixth and seventh seal-visions. But in this passage the relation is the more difficult, especially from the fact that the interlude, not so definitely circumscribed as that of ch. vii., proceeds from the continuous course of the proper main visions, since, at any rate, one part of what is described from x. 1 to xi. 13 belongs to the *second woe*, whose conclusion is marked in xi. 14, but whose first part was contained in the sixth trumpet-vision.[1] This must be firmly maintained, as a matter of course, against De Wette, etc., who find the second woe in ix. 13–21, yet without supporting further false consequences upon this error contrary to the context, but especially against Hengstenb.,

[1] Cf. ix. 12.

according to whom the entire conception of the section, x. 1–xi. 14 (and still further of xi. 15 sqq.), coincides with the view that the episode extends from x. 1 to xi. 13, and that xi. 14 immediately joins ix. 21. But if something were not contained within this episode that belongs to the second woe, xi. 14 could not stand in its place, but must immediately follow ix. 21. — Ebrard commits an error opposite to that of Hengstenb., since he [1] finds the second woe only within the episode,[2] and so conceals the entrance of the episode into the course of the trumpet-visions, that he does *not* reckon the sixth trumpet-plague in the second woe. Cf., besides, Vitr., who, on the other hand, identifies the sixth trumpet-vision with the second woe, and reckons it as continuing until xi. 16.[3] — In another form, the question recurs to the relation of the interlude to the main course of the visions, if the subject considered be how far the prophecy (x. 11) extends, which John is to proclaim as a consequence of having eaten the book offered him by the angel (x. 2, 8 sqq.). Prior to the exposition of the details, it may be remarked concerning the meaning of the entire section, x. 1–xi. 14: (1) The essential reference of the interlude in which an angel from heaven brings John a little book, in order that he may eat it and then prophesy anew, is determined by a formal address of the angel himself, confirmed by an oath (ver. 7), viz., that forthwith at the seventh sound of the trumpet, as also the entire course of the visions hitherto leads us to expect, the end is to come. (2) Immediately with the sounding of the seventh trumpet, coincides the speedy approach of the third woe (xi. 14) If it were conceded that the part of the second woe described in ch. 11 referred to the destruction of Jerusalem (cf. ver. 8), it would be obvious how precisely John distinguishes the proper final catastrophe, to which the chief course of the visions extends, from that act of judgment still falling in the second woe, but at the same time also preserves the inner connection between this special act of judgment and that final fulfilment,[4] i e., the eschatological character of the judgment on Jerusalem, by representing both in the one consequence of the woe.

Vv. 1, 2. An angel comes down from heaven with an open little book in his hand. — *εἶδον — καταβαίνοντα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.* A difficulty has been found in that John, whose own standpoint from iv. 1 is in heaven, sees an angel descend from heaven. Eichh., therefore, explains very arbitrarily: "In the heavenly theatre wherein the whole drama is being represented, he descended from that part which expressed heaven, to that which imitated the earth."[5] Hengstenb. obliterates that precise presentation from a standpoint taken in the vision: "It is most natural that John, from the earth, saw the mighty angel descend from heaven." Nevertheless he does not admit, with De Wette, that here, as in vii. 1 sqq., the seer has exchanged his standpoint in heaven [6] for one on earth, — yet without understanding how the seer descended, — but Hengstenb. does not allow the application of any distinction between the one standpoint and the other: "That John is in heaven, is to be understood positively, and not exclusively." As, according to John iii. 13,

[1] p. 348 sqq.
[2] "The calamities (ix. 13–xi. 14) pertain to the second woe; i.e., to the sixth trumpet."
[3] Viz., xi. 13.
[4] Cf. Matt. xxiv.
[5] Cf., on the other hand, also ver. 2.
[6] iv. 1 sqq.

Christ was "at the same time in heaven and on earth," so, in a certain respect, such twofoldness of existence is peculiar to all believers, according to Phil. iii. 20. But the question here is not concerning ethical citizenship in heaven, but concerning the locality fixed for ecstatic consciousness. Ewald properly maintains the heavenly standpoint of the seer, which is here as unobjectionable as in vi. 12 sqq., vii. 1 sqq., viii. 5, 7, 8, 10, ix. 1 sqq., xiii. sqq. Cf., concerning this, Introduction, sec. 1. — *ἄλλον ἄγγελον ἰσχυρόν*. The angel distinguished from other angels by the *ἄλλον* is, as little as the one mentioned in vii. 2 or viii. 3, Christ himself.[1] The very form of the oath, ver. 6, is not appropriate to Christ.[2] When, on the other hand, Hengstenb. judges: "It would be presumption for a created angel to make such professions," because only God himself "could grant the Church what is here granted it," he mistakes the announcement by the angelic messengers for the granting, i.e., the accomplishment; and when Hengstenb. afterwards remarks that "the appearance of Christ as an angel is in the same line with his state of humiliation," and he therefore swears by Him who had sent him, this neither agrees with the preceding judgment, nor is in itself correct, because we can in no respect think of the heavenly Christ as in the form of humiliation. More correctly, therefore, have the older expositors explained, who regarded the mighty angel as the Lord himself in so far as they found in his entire appearance, and his individual attributes, a glory which belonged to no mere angel.[3] — The more accurate determination, however, of the angel, transcends the text:[4] we can inquire only concerning the relation indicated by the *ἄλλον*. De Wette, Hengstenb., etc., propose a contrast with the trumpet-angels;[5] but partly because of the designation *ἄλλ. ἀγγ. ἰσχυρόν*, and partly because of the parallel of the book with the sealed book, ch. v., the reference to the *ἀγγ. ἰσχυρόν* (v. 2) appears to be nearer.[6] [See Note LXIII., p. 308.] *περιβεβλημένον νεφέλην — πυρός*. With correctness, Beng., Ew., etc., proceed to comprehend the four special points of the description in their unified significance. These are, however, emblematic attributes which must be understood in the concrete biblical sense. Thus the parallel of the Horatian *Nube candentes humeros amictus augur Apollo*[7] appears purely accidental and inwardly remote; and as the entire description has as its intention something more definite than to represent in general the brilliancy of the angel's form, so the clothing him in a cloud has not only the external purpose to subdue to a certain extent that brilliancy.[8] The cloud characterizes the angel as a messenger of divine judgment.[9] With this agree "the feet as pillars of fire,"[10] while the rainbow, the sign of the covenant of grace,[11] on

[1] Against Beda, Alcas., Zeg., Aret., Par., Calov., Hengstenb., etc. Cf. also Vitr., who is unwilling to distinguish between the Second and Third Persons of the Godhead. For the correct interpretation, see Andr., Rib., Vieg., C. a Lap., Stern, Beng., De Wette, etc.

[2] Cf. Beng.

[3] Cf. Beda, Zeg., Calov., etc.

[4] Against Rinck, who means even the trumpet angels, xvii. 1, xxi. 9.

[5] Perhaps with the eagle-angel, viii. 13 (De Wette).

[6] Beng., Ebrard.

[7] "The augur Apollo, with his shining shoulders clothed with a shining cloud" (Lib. I., Od. 2, ver. 31).

[8] Against Ewald; cf. also Heinr., etc.

[9] Cf. i. 7; Hengstenb., Ebrard.

[10] Cf. i. 15.

[11] Cf. iv. 3; Gen. ix. 11 sqq.

the head of the angel, makes the angel appear as a messenger of peace, and the face shining like the sun[1] is an expression of the heavenly δόξα belonging thereto. The apparently contradictory emblems perfectly agree with the message which the angel himself formally announces, ver. 7; for if the O. T. promise confirmed by him is directed to final joy and eternal peace, the fulfilment, nevertheless, does not occur without the dreadful development of a judgment which the seventh trumpet is yet to make known. Just as, therefore, in this μυστήριον τοῦ θεοῦ the terrors of the act of judgment precede its blessed fulfilment, so also the appearing of the heavenly messenger proclaims both at the same time. — The wrong interpretation of the emblematic attributes of the angel[2] coincides in many expositors with the fact that they regarded the angel Christ; as Beda: "The face of the Lord shining, i.e., his knowledge manifested by the glory of the resurrection, and the feet of him about to preach the gospel, and to announce peace illumined with the fire of the Holy Spirit, and strengthened like a pillar." Zeg, Aretius, etc., interpreted the clouds as Christ's flesh. — καὶ ἔχων ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ βιβλαρίδιον ἠνεωγμένον. Concerning the relation of this little book to the book, ch. v., what is said in ver. 8 sqq. first affords a judgment. From a comparison with ver. 5, the result is reached, that it was the left hand of the angel which held the book.[3] But this is designated here a small book, by the diminutive form, not for the reason that only an inconsiderable volume is adapted for being eaten,[4] — to such reflection, even a βιβλαρίδιον must appear too large, — also not in comparison with the large form of the angel,[5] but corresponding with the contents, which constitute only one part of the βιβλίον, ch. v.[6] This book is brought to the seer *opened*, in contrast with the sealed book, which could be opened only by the Lamb, because John is to understand its full contents, to take the book into himself (cf. ver. 9), and then to prophesy. — καὶ ἔθηκε — τῆς γῆς. By the angel's placing his feet of fire upon the sea and the earth, he shows not only that "his intelligence belongs to the earth and the sea (the islands);"[7] but more definitely according to the analogy presented in Ps. viii. 7, cviii. 10, cx. 1, and corresponding to the entire meaning of the angelic form, he thus represents the power of God in judgment, whose messenger he is, as extending over the whole earth.[8] The significant meaning, in this passage, of the angel in general, and of his course especially, is, however, to be understood only when the sea and the earth are interpreted no more allegorically than the angel himself. C. a Lap. thinks, in accord with Alcas., of heathen and Jews, to whom Christ preaches, i.e., causes the gospel to be preached. Hengstenb. abides by his interpretation of the sea as the sea of peoples, and the earth as the cultivated world, as Beng. by his interpretation of Europe and Asia. If the question be in general, concerning a particular sign that these allegorizing explanations do not belong to the text, it is answered in that they either do not at all[9]

[1] Cf. i. 16, xviii. 1.

[2] Concerning the allegorical explanation of the whole, see the close of the chapter.

[3] Beng.

[4] Eichh.

[5] Beng.

[6] Ew. See on ver. 8 sqq.

[7] De Wette.

[8] Cf. Ew., Hengstenb., Volkm.

[9] Beng., Hengstenb.; also De Wette, etc.

explain the not indifferent course of the angel, who puts his right foot upon the sea and his left upon the earth, or that they do so with entire impropriety.[1] John, as an inhabitant of Asia Minor, could not well, unless an entirely vague idea be entertained of him, regard the sea otherwise than in the definite form of the Mediterranean; while the place on earth on which the angel sets his foot is naturally the Asiatic main land. If the question be now concerning the idea lying in the setting-up of pillars of fire, as such, it is of course a matter of indifference as to what part of the sea and earth the seer could naturally have had in mind for his concrete contemplation; but it cannot be without more definite reference, if the region towards which the so significant form of the angel is directed be indicated by the accurately described posture. The angel stands with his right foot on the sea, with his left on the earth; and this is naturally to be concretely represented from the precise horizon of the seer, in the given way, if the angel look towards the south, towards the region of Jerusalem. But how well this agrees with his message (ver. 6 sqq) and the contents of the book brought him, will be clear when the result is reached as to how the message of the angel refers especially to the judgment on Jerusalem. This applies also against Ew. ii., who explains: The angel put his right, i.e., his first (?), foot upon the Mediterranean, and then the left upon the land, i.e., Italy and Rome. Then only the more remote goal of the prophecy now beginning (ch. xiii. sqq.) would be indicated, while the important reference to the nearest object of the prophecy, Jerusalem (xi. 1 sqq.), would in an incomprehensible way be lacking.

Vv. 3, 4. At a mighty call of the angel, seven voices of thunder sounded what John, however, was forbidden to write. — *καὶ ἔκραξε — μυκῶνται.* What the angel called, the text in no way indicates; at any rate, Beng. is incorrect in saying that what is described in ver. 6 may have been expressed by this cry. Only in general, the *threatening* character[2] of this cry is to be recognized already from the fact that the mighty voice belonging to the strong angel[3] is compared expressly with the roar of the lion,[4] as in the immediately succeeding and, as it were, responsive voices of thunder. — The word *μυκᾶσθαι* properly expresses the bellowing of the bull,[5] yet in Theocritus[6] there is also found *μύκημα λεαίνης.* [See Note LXIV., p. 308.] *αἱ ἑπτὰ βρονταί.* The art., which suggests some particular thunder, cannot refer to iv. 5.[7] Ewald's explanation, "*All seven thunders* of the heavens seem to intimate that the whole heaven must be considered as having exclaimed with an unheard-of and terrible clamor," has no biblical foundation, and proceeds from the later Jewish conception of seven heavens, as it ascribes to each heaven a special thunder. Heinr. says, too indefinitely: "Seven mightier thunders," but is

[1] Cf., e.g., Stern: The *stronger* right foot indicates the emphasis with which the world — the sea — is warned of the danger of Antichrist.

[2] In so far, Ew. ii. decides not incorrectly ("Rome, thou fallest"); but the threatening of the angel in his cry, as in his significant manifestation, is directed first to Jerusalem, and afterwards to Rome.

[3] Cf. vi. 1, vii. 2.

[4] Cf. Hos. xi. 10; Am. iii. 8.

[5] Phavorinus: *βρυχᾶσθαι ἐπὶ λέοντος· μυχᾶσθαι ἐπὶ βοός.* Cf. Wetst.

[6] Id. xxvi. 21.

[7] Against Beng.

correct in making a comparison with the *seven* spirits of God,[1] and the *seven* angels; [2] for here, where the question is concerning a definite manifestation by thunder, this occurs not only in the concrete number seven, — to which, besides, a certain outward occasion may have been given in the sevenfold description of the Divine voices of thunder, Ps. xxix.,[3] — but their sound is regarded also by John as a significant speech (ἐλάλησαν), as each thunder uttered its special voice (τ. ἑαυτῶν φωνάς) which brought an intelligible revelation to the prophet. — In accordance with the command, i. 11, John wanted to write down what the thunder had said; the ἤμελλον γρ., *I was on the point* of writing,[4] which does not suit the standpoint of proper vision, since within this any writing is inconceivable,[5] is explained from the standpoint of the composition of the book; but the exchange of these two standpoints is without difficulty, when considered as referring to the prophet now writing out his vision, and as based, indeed, upon the essential identity of the Divine revelation, which guides the writing, as well as the gazing, prophet, when he receives, in respect to *this* revelation, another command: καὶ ἤκουσα, κ.τ.λ. The καὶ has neither here, nor anywhere else, an adversative meaning, but simply connects the new point, whose inner opposition to the preceding is *not* precisely marked.[6] — φωνὴν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. The expression does not compel us to regard John no longer in heaven;[7] also from the standpoint which John occupies from iv. 1 (cf. ver. 1), he could designate a voice sounding from the depth of heaven as a φων. ἐκ τ. οὐρ. That the voice belonged to Christ, — as Beng. infers from the command, i. 11, which here suffers an exception, — remains an ingenious conjecture. Ew. ii. proposes the angel-attendant of i. 1. See *in loc.* — The heavenly voice demands a *complete* silence concerning all that the thunders had uttered: σφράγισον — καὶ μὴ αὐτὰ γράψῃς. The sealing is to occur just by the not writing; compare the reverse relation, xxii. 10. Contrary to the text, therefore, is every explanation that finds [8] in this passage a sealing that is in any way conditional,[9] and entirely improper is the question as to what were the contents of the voices of the thunders. Beda regarded them identical with the seven trumpets; Zeg., as the oracles of all the prophets — before Christ; Hengstenb.[10] thinks: "what is announced later concerning the destruction of the enemies of the kingdom of God, and the final victory, must be essentially identical with what is here previously kept secret." Others have tried to conjecture from the context, if not the contents, yet the subject and character, of the utterance of the thunders. Hofm. has offered what is, in every respect, the

[1] i. 4, iv. 5.
[2] viii. 2.
[3] Züll., Hengstenb., Ebrard.
[4] Cf. xii. 4.
[5] From an entirely mechanical idea of inspiration, the writing within an ecstasy of course appears inconceivable. Thus, e.g., even Lämmert (*Babel*, p. 27 sq.) thinks: John, who in his writing had actually proceeded as far as the close of ch. ix., would have written even further.
[6] Cf. Winer, p. 407 sqq.
[7] De Wette.
[8] Cf. Dan. xii. 4, 9.
[9] Beda: "Do not display the mysteries of the Christian faith to all everywhere, lest they grow common, neither conceal them from the good, lest they be altogether hidden." Hengstenb., who justifies Brightmann's paraphrase: "Do not insert these utterances in this, but reserve them for another, more appropriate place." Cf. also Ew. ii.
[10] Cf. also Stern.

strangest suggestion, when he imagines how the seven thunders had expressed the blessed mystery of the new world. Beng. considered the voices of thunder as those which mightily proclaim the praise of God. The other expositors have more correctly maintained the threatening significance of the voices of thunder; but their relation to the call of the angel is arbitrarily stated by Herd.: "The thunders declared their curses, but John was forbidden to write them, as they are not to disturb the angel's glad message;" and by Eichh.: "The thunders had announced the sad contents of the little book, in order that the glad message might remain for the angel."[1] The seven thunders are referred to definite individual facts by Vitr., who understands the seven crusades; and by Ebrard, who thinks of the seven acts of God which will occur before the beginning of the seventh trumpet, and whereby God obtains for his people rest, and for himself glory before his enemies. Better than all the exegetes who have even attempted to discover something concerning the contents of the voices of thunder, did S. Brigitta esteem the text, of whom the legend says, that she wanted to know what the voices of thunder announced to John; she therefore prayed for a special revelation from God, and received it, whereby it was revealed to her that the thunder prophesied terrible judgments upon the persecutors of the Church.[2] — The question has also been asked, why John did not dare write the utterance of the thunders. Incorrectly, Züll.: "Because unbelievers would not be converted;" but it is neither certain that the thunder-voices had any such tendency, nor is the presumption in itself correct.[3] Ew. mentions the contents of the voices of the thunder as "exceeding human comprehension;"[4] but John not only understood that declaration, but also regarded it intelligible to others, as he wanted to write it. De Wette says only, that thereby the mysteriousness is to be increased. Volkm. recognizes only a literary reason: for writing, or rather for announcing, there is no longer time, as now the second part, the realization, comes.[5] Yet there is still time sufficient to refer to new announcements (vv. 6, 11); for they follow as such, and not as realizations. It is well simply to acknowledge what is most obvious; viz., that the holy wisdom of God has given no account as to why this special revelation has not been made universal[6]

Vv. 5–7. The angel swears that immediately, viz., in the time of the seventh trumpet, which is at once to sound, the mystery of God shall be finished. — *ἦρε τ. χεῖρα αὐτ. τ. δεξιὰν εἰς τ. οὐρανὸν.* The angel can raise[7] only his right hand, because his left holds the little book, ver. 2. The significance of the gesture is derived from the form of the oath. He raises his hand to heaven as to the high and holy place where the Eternal, and Almighty dwells,[8] who even himself, in swearing by himself, raises his own hand to heaven.[9] — Concerning the *ἐν* in connection with *ὤμωσεν*, cf. Matt. v. 34 sqq.; Winer, p. 364. — *τῷ ζῶντι εἰς τ. αἰων. — ὃς ἔκτισε τ. οὐρανὸν, κ.τ.λ.* The

[1] Cf. ver. 9 sq., *πικρανεῖ* and *γλυκύ*.
[2] Cf. C. a Lap.
[3] Cf. xi. 13.
[4] Cf. Beng., who refers to 2 Cor. xii. 4.
[5] See on p. 25.
[6] Cf. Acts i. 7.
[7] Cf. Dan. xii. 7; Gen. xiv. 22.
[8] Cf. Isa. lvii. 15.
[9] Deut. xxxii. 40.

pragmatic reference of this appeal to God, as the Eternal and Creator of all things, lies in the fact that the subject of the oath is the *μυστήριον τοῦ θεοῦ*, therefore something concealed in God's eternal decree, but which, in his time, he has not only in prophecy announced, — through the ancient prophets (ver. 7), and now through John (ver. 11, i. 1 sqq.), — but also the Almighty Lord will infallibly bring about,[1] and that, too, *ἐν τάχει* (i. 1). For the angel swears, *ὅτι χρόνος οὐκέτι ἔσται*, "that there should be time no longer." The authentic norm for the correct explanation of this expression is given by what follows, which defines the same thing from the contrasted side, *ἀλλ' ἐν τ. ἡμ., κ.τ.λ.*). It is accordingly not an "entrance of a modern thought," [2] but a complete misunderstanding of the text, when many interpreters, following Beda,[3] have understood the words *χρόνος οὐκέτι ἔσται*, of the absolute cessation of time, i.e., of the beginning of eternity. The opposite parallel, *ἀλλ' ἐν τ. ἡμέραις, κ.τ.λ.*, by virtue of its chronological nature, excludes every explanation which presents the formula *χρόνος οὐκέτι ἔσται* in any other way than chronologically. Ebrard, accordingly, is also incorrect when he understands by the *χρόνος*, a season of *grace*. On the other hand, however, the contrast, ver. 7, as well as also the tenor of the formula *χρόν. οὐκ. ἐστ.*, forbids us to recognize in this a definite, technical expression of Apocalyptic chronology, as Bengel wished, who found here a "*non-chronus*," i.e., a period of more than a thousand and less than eleven hundred years, and accordingly reckoned the closing epoch of this "*non-chronus*" (i.e., the beginning of the thousand years' reign) as the year 1836, since the starting-point occurred, at all events, *before* the year 842, the concluding year of the second woe,[4] and apparently in the year 800, in which the reign was established. Grot., Calov., Vitr., C. a Lap., Eichh., Ew., De Wette., Hengstenb., etc., have correctly recognized the fact that the words *χρόν. οὐκ. ἔσται* express the *immediate*, and the indeed very positively defined (ver. 7), beginning of that which is called in ver. 7 the fulfilment of the mystery of God. But naturally, from this formal unanimity of the most expositors, there proceeds directly the greatest diversity of views, when the question is concerning the more precise reference of the formula, *χρόν. οὐκ. ἔσ.* according to the standard of what is said in ver. 7. But Vitr. is inaccurate, even in a formal respect, when he says, "No delay of time is to intervene between the sound of the seventh trumpet, and the fulfilment of the prophetic oracles;" [5] for the affirmative determination, ver. 7, says in apposition to the words *ὅτι χρ. οὐκ. ἔσται*, which deny a further delay, that the (immediate, ver. 6) fulfilment of the mystery of God is to occur just at the time of the seventh trumpet. The question, therefore, is not concerning a delay, perhaps still occurring between the seventh sound of the trumpet and the fulfilment of the mystery of God; but the angel swears that between the present point of time (which falls *after* the close of the sixth trumpet, and *before* the second part of the second woe, that is finished only at xi. 14), and the fulfilment of the mystery of God, which is to be expected within the time of the seventh trumpet, there will be no more

[1] Cf. the entirely similar reference of God's self-designation, i. 8.

[2] Hengstenb.

[3] "At the last trumpet, the mutable variety of secular ages will cease."

[4] Cf. on ix. 13 sqq.

[5] Likewise Hengstenb.

interval. [See Note LXV., p. 309.] What, therefore, might have been expected already after the close of the sixth seal-vision, but yet did not occur, because ch. vii. brought a special preparation, — and, besides, from the seventh seal itself the new series of trumpet-visions proceeded, ch. viii. sq., — is not to come immediately, and that, too, in the seventh trumpet. Yet it does not actually occur in xi. 16–19.[1] — ἀλλ' ἐν τ. ἡμέραις τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ ἑβδ. ἀγγ. These words in combination with the immediately succeeding ὅταν μέλλῃ σαλπίζειν, which contain an epexegetical description of the φωνῆς τ. ἑβδ. ἀγγ., appear to require an explanation like that of Bengel: "Thus the angel makes himself heard, not only at the beginning of these days, but continually throughout them." The additional remark, "at the end of the days this trumpet acquires the name of the last trump" (1 Cor. xv. 52), is, of course, entirely without foundation in the context. But even the first statement of Bengel conflicts with the analogy of all the trumpet-voices hitherto in their proper nature (which, nevertheless, the words ὅταν μέλλῃ σαλπ. themselves recall); since, by the heavenly trumpet-sounds, not future things themselves, but only such manifestations as signify what is to occur on earth, are introduced. The seeming difficulty which lies, therefore, in the fact that what is said in ver. 7 is of the "days" of the seventh trumpet, but which cannot be explained by regarding a continuance of the trumpet-voice during the whole of the still future period of that (actual) day, is very simply explained if it be acknowledged[2] that in the expression ἐν τ. ἡμέραις τ. φων. τ. ἑβδ. αγγ. the standpoint of the vision is not purely maintained, but the reference to the events of the sixth trumpet-vision is intermingled; only from this last standpoint can we properly speak of the "days" of the last trumpet, viz., of the period in which that which is represented to the prophet by the final sound of the trumpet actually occurs. — καὶ ἐτελέσθη. The annexing of the conclusion is Hebraistic, since the καὶ with the aor. corresponds to the Vav with the perf.[3] — τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ θεοῦ. The contextual determination of this idea — whose character is indicated, in general, already by the correlate ideas of divine revelation (εὐηγγέλισε), and of prophecy (τ. προφ.) as the human announcement of the mystery revealed on God's part[4] — lies partly in the fact that its actual fulfilment[5] is placed in the time of the seventh, and consequently the last, trumpet; partly in that its revelation is conceived of by the prophets as a εὐαγγελίζειν, i.e., a communication of a joyful message. Besides, it needs no special proof, that the expression τοὺς ἑαυτ. δούλ., τοὺς προφήτας[6] can refer only to O. T. prophets,[7] but neither to N. T. prophets,[8] nor to Christ and the apostles,[9] as the mystery of God revealed to these prophets, and proclaimed by them, is infinitely more than the "divine counsel concerning freeing Christians from the oppression of the Jews."[10]

[1] Against Hengstenb., etc. See on that passage.

[2] Cf. De Wette.

[3] Exod. xvi. 6, xvii. 4, where the LXX. translate by καὶ with the fut. Cf. Ewald, Ebrard, Winer, p. 260.

[4] Cf. Introduction, p. 32.

[5] Cf. Luke xviii. 31.

[6] Concerning the acc., besides εὐηγγέλισε, cf. Winer, p. 209.

[7] N. de Lyra, Beng., De Wette, etc.

[8] Grot., who seeks them altogether among the elders, v. 5, vii. 13.

[9] Eichh.

[10] Eichh. Cf. Grot.: "That indeed is, that Christians were allowed by Hadrian a resi-

According to the contextual indication just given, the *μυστήριον τοῦ θεοῦ*, whose contents are here declared only by the general allusion to the O. T. predictions, refers to nothing but the glorious completion of the divine kingdom, the final goal whereto the deepest current of O. T. prophecy, which is on that account essentially an Apocalyptic element, tends. The next authentic explanation of the proper contents of the *μυστ. τ. θ.* is contained in the heavenly song of praise sounding forth after the seventh sound of the trumpet, xi. 17 sqq.

Vv. 8–11. At the command of the heavenly voice (ver. 4), John eats the little book given him by the angel, and receives the instruction that he must once again prophesy. — *ἡ φωνὴ, ἣν ἤκουσα — καὶ λέγουσαν.* The construction in this correct reading[1] is like that of iv. 1, but yet unsymmetrical, as here not only the *λέγων* in the mind of the author is received into the relative clause by attraction, but also the *πάλιν* is placed before *λαλοῦσαν* because of the connection of the declaration just repeated with that mentioned, ver. 4. If the sentence in which, in any case, the aor. *ἤκουσα* is intended as a plusquamperfect, were altogether symmetrical in its reference to ver. 4 (cf. iv. 1), its construction in accord with the nom. *ἡ φωνὴ* would run: *κ. ἡ φων., ἣν ἤκ. ἐκ τ. οὐρ. λαλοῦσαν μετ' ἐμοῦ, πάλιν ἐλάλησεν μετ' ἐμοῦ λέγουσα (λέγων).* Likewise De Wette, Ebrard. — *ὕπαγε.* As in xvi. 1, Matt. v. 24, viii. 4, etc.,[2] an actual going is represented, accordingly in ver. 9 it is said *ἀπῆλθα.* — *λάβε*, cf. v. 7. John is to take this book to himself (ver. 9). — *ἀπῆλθα πρὸς τὸν ἄγγ.* How John, who continues to have his standpoint in heaven (cf. ver. 1), could go to the angel who stands on the earth and sea, is not made perceptible to sober view, because in the vision the question is only concerning the act of going. But even if one, like De Wette, consider that John, even prior to ch. x., "had occupied the standpoint of Zechariah, Ezekiel, and Daniel," the difficulty of the *ἀπῆλθα* remains essentially the same; hence De Wette has properly reached *no* conclusion from this expression concerning the standpoint of John. — *δοῦναι.* Concerning this inf.,[3] dependent on the *λέγων*, cf. Winer, p. 296. — *κατάφαγε αὐτό.* The eating of the book[4] is within the entire visionary scene not to be regarded an expression intended allegorically, but as a real act of John; just as Ezekiel (ii. 9 sqq.) by eating a book receives the contents of its prophetic discourses. The meaning of the visionary fact is correctly given already by Beda: "Take into your inward parts, and contain within the space of thy heart." What Jer. xv. 16 in figurative language calls an eating of the words of divine revelation, which must be converted by the prophet into marrow and blood,[5] we find here, as in Ezekiel, represented in an actual visionary transaction.[6] — *καὶ πικρανεῖ — μέλι.* From the fact that the angel speaks first of the bitter effect and then of the sweet taste of the little book, but John himself (ver. 10) the reverse, it does not follow that "both vigorously struggled for priority."[7] Accord-

dence at Jerusalem, and the free worship of God and Christ there."

[1] See Critical Notes.

[2] Cf. the *ἦλθε*, v. 7; also the *ἔρχου*, vi. 4, 5, 7.

[3] Acts xxi. 21.

[4] Cf. ver. 10, where the command is fulfilled by John.

[5] Cf., besides, Ps. xl. 9.

[6] Ew., etc. Cf. Knobel, *Proph.*, I. p. 373.

[7] Hengstenb.

ing to the context, the "priority" belongs — not only as to order, but also as to minor dignity — to the sweetness, because the book comes first into the mouth and last into the belly. According to this most simple order, John himself reports, ver. 10. The angel looks at it differently, since he speaks, — as the combination of the two expressions into one antithesis shows, — not according to the mere consequences, but with respect to the inner nature and effect. The angel intends first to prepare John for the bitter effect, but then he also says that the book will be in his mouth sweet as honey. This is also against Beng., who, by a comparison of vv. 9 and 10, immediately infers two kinds of sweetness, one before and one after the bitterness. — The relation of *πικρανεῖ σου τὴν κοιλίαν* (*ἐπικράνθη ἡ κοιλ. μ.*, ver. 10, cf. viii. 11) and *γλυκὺ ὡς μέλι* is, in accordance with the context, to be determined according to both norms: that one and the same book is sweet and bitter according as it enters the mouth or the belly; then, that the distinction between the mouth and the belly is understood only with reference to the eating. Incorrect, therefore, are both the explanation which refers the sweetness and bitterness to the difference between the joyful and the sad contents of the book,[1] — in connection with which a further error is readily intruded, that, with a result contrary to the context, speaks of "bitter-sweet" contents, indicating that only after a sad visitation could glorious joy enter;[2] and also that which — in connection with a false interpretation of the little book itself, of the *πάλιν προφητ.*, ver. 11, yea even of the angel, vv. 1, 8 — regards the mouth of John not as the organ of eating (receiving), but of speaking, and then refers the bitterness to the persecutions and all the hinderances with which the evangelical preaching of John or the entire Church met.[3] With correctness, Vitr., C. a Lap., De Wette, Stern, Hengstenb., etc., have interpreted, that, as the mouth refers to the receiving of the revelation given in the little book, so the *κοιλία* — not *καρδία*, as Cod. A reads, and Andr. explains, disturbing the clearness of the idea of the text by mingling therewith a rash interpretation — is directed to the comprehension, i.e., the further scrutiny[4] and perception, of the revelation received. [See Note LXVI., p. 309.] How little the sweetness of the reception, as such, was hindered by the bitterness of the contents of revelation, is shown by the symbol of Ezekiel, in whose mouth the book written with mourning and woe is *ὡς μέλι γλυκάζον*.[5] But he also went *bitterly*, after he had filled his belly therewith,[6] in the heat of his spirit.[7] — By eating the book, John is made able to proclaim its contents. Therefore ver. 11 follows: *καὶ λέγουσίν μοι, κ.τ.λ.* The plur.[8] makes the speaking subject entirely indefinite; the modified var. points to the angel. — *δεῖ σε πάλιν προφ.* The *δεῖ* designates not the inner, subjective necessity, that John now cannot help prophesying, because by eating the book he has been capacitated for prophesying,[9] but the objective necessity depending upon the will of God, who

[1] Heinr., Ewald.
[2] Herd., Rinck.
[3] Beda, Aret., Par., etc.
[4] Cf. 1 Pet. i. 10 sq.
[5] Ezek. iii. 3; cf. ii. 10.
[6] Ver. 3: *ἡ κοιλία σου πλησθήσεται.*
[7] Ver. 14: מָרַר, which the LXX. do not at all translate.
[8] Cf. xii. 6.
[9] Beng., Hengstenb.

accordingly gives his revelation.[1] The πάλιν does not contrast John's prophecy with that of the ancient prophets,[2] but designates a second προφητεῦσαι of John himself, yet not a preaching after a return from exile,[3] but the new prophecy for which the eaten book has fitted him in its relation to the prophesying practised upon the ground of previous visions. This πάλιν προφητεῦσαι occurs therefore in the succeeding part of the Apoc.[4] — ἐπὶ λαοῖς — πολλοῖς. Incorrectly, Beng: "To nations — beyond," in the sense that there are still many nations, etc., which are, meantime, to come before that is fulfilled which is here described prior to the transition to the second woe. Ἐπί has this meaning neither in Heb. ix. 17, 1 Cor. xiv. 26, nor elsewhere. Likewise incorrectly, Ebrard: "Before nations," i.e., so that "the nations have it declared to them." The ἐπὶ with the dat. designates, precisely as in John xii. 16, the object which the prophecy grasps, i.e., concerning which the prophecy is made. The grammatical relation is precisely the same as in the construction of ἐπί with the dative accompanying verbs designating joy, astonishment, etc., *concerning* any thing.[5] The occasion for the false construction of the ἐπὶ lies, in Ebrard, in the view of the contents of the book, and the range of the prophecy conditioned thereby. If the πάλιν προφητεῦσαι is completed with xi. 13, and is intended for the Church, it cannot be said here, ver. 11, that John is to prophesy *concerning* nations and kings; and if Hengstenb., who likewise[6] finds in xi. 1–13 the prophecy announced in ver. 11, and refers it to the degenerate churches, yet explains correctly the ἐπὶ λαοῖς, κ.τ.λ., and compares therewith what is said of kings, chs. xvi., xvii., xix., this is inconsistent with his view of the little book and the πάλ. προφ., just to the extent that it is correct according to the context. Ewald — who agrees formally with Hengstenb. and Ebrard, since he also finds in xi. 1–13 the contents of the eaten book, but interprets this new prophecy as referring to the destruction of Jerusalem — refers the ἐπὶ λαοῖς, κ.τ.λ., to xi. 2, 7, 9; but since the prophecy xi. 1–13 is actually one concerning Jerusalem, it cannot well be called at x. 11 a prophecy concerning peoples, nations, languages, and many kings.[7] Besides, Ew. has understood the significant position of the angel, ver. 2, with relation to Rome as capital of the world. The result, therefore, is not that the ἐπὶ is explained ungrammatically, but that we must seek the correct reference of the πάλιν προφητεῦσαι, which must concur with the correct view of the contents of the little book eaten. Upon this depends the ultimate determination of the view of the entire transaction in ch. x.

The allegorical explanations are to be rejected, as entirely in violation of the context, which betray their arbitrariness by their infinite diversity. The mighty angel, ver. 1, can as little stand for the Emperor Justin, the defender of the Church against the Arians, and the Emperor Justinian,[8]

[1] Cf., in general, i. 1 sqq.
[2] Primas, Beda, Vleg.
[3] Beng.
[4] Grot., Alcas., De Wette, Hengstenb., Ebrard, etc., who, in the more accurate determination, vary much in other respects from one another.
[5] Winer, p. 368.
[6] Cf. also Klief.
[7] i.e., all the world, those κατοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. Cf. v. 9.
[8] Ver. 8. N. de Lyra.

or[1] the evangelical preachers, as whose representative others, like Beda already, understand John, or indeed the Pope,[2] as the little book eaten by John can be the *Codex Justinianus*,[3] or the N. T.[4] The most important interpreters[5] are unanimous in regarding the contents of this little book, which is eaten, as prophecy which is written in the Apoc. itself, and that, too, in the part which follows ch. x. But there is controversy both as to the more accurate determination of the section which is regarded as containing the prophecy proceeding from the book that is eaten, and also, which is essentially connected therewith, as to the relation between the book that is eaten, and the seal-book, ch. v. The opinion that both books are identical[6] is answered already by the fact that John, after having thus far prophesied upon the ground of the book of ch. v., now is to prophesy anew upon the ground of the little book that is eaten. Accordingly, the directly opposite view is readily suggested, that both books have nothing whatever to do with one another, but that the little book, ch. x., contains something entirely peculiar, viz., what is described in xi. 1–13: i.e., according to Grot., Wetst., Eichh., Ew., the fate of Jerusalem; according to Hengstenb., the fate of the degenerate Church.[7] But it is neither correct that the contents of the book of fate, ch. v., are already fully settled in what has been hitherto given,[8] nor is it conceivable that that book of fate should contain nothing of the fate of Jerusalem, the "degenerate Church,"[9] which is not to be revealed to the prophet until by the little book, ch. x.;[10] neither, if the contents of the book that is eaten be limited to xi. 1–13, whether in Ewald's or Hengstenb.'s sense, does it agree with the statement of ver. 11, according to which John is to prophesy concerning peoples and many kings. The instance deduced from ver. 11[11] applies also against Vitr., who, in the little book of ch. x., finds a part of the book of ch. v., limits its contents likewise to xi. 1–13, and interprets it as a prophecy concerning the calamities of the Western Church. The correct point in Vitr. is the view that the little book of ch. x. comprises a part of all that which is to happen contained in the book of fate of ch. v.; viz., all that which has *not, as yet*, issued from the book of fate through the succession of seal- and trumpet-visions; in other words, all that from xi. 1 has been written by John in consequence of the δεῖ σε πάλιν προφητεῦσαι, κ.τ.λ.;[12] therefore not in the false sense[13] that "the book of completion" only substantially repeats, in its way, the contents already present in the preceding "book of declaration." This follows from what in x. 11 is said concerning the prophecy of John, which proceeds from the book which was eaten; but it admits the less a restriction to xi. 1–13 (where what is said is concerning Jerusalem), and rather requires the more certainly the further reference to what is written, ch. xii.

[1] According to the older Protestant expositors.
[2] Luther.
[3] N. de Lyra.
[4] Aret., etc.
[5] C. a Lap., Grot., Calov., Vitr., Beng., Ew., De Wette, Hengstenb., etc.
[6] C. a Lap., Zeger, Calov.
[7] Cf. also Ebrard.
[8] Against Hengstenb.
[9] Hengstenb.
[10] Against Ewald, etc.
[11] Cf. ver. 6 sqq.
[12] Beng., De Wette.
[13] Volkm.

sqq., as the discourse of the angel, x. 6 sq., extending to the full end, stands in more significant parallel with the contents of the book brought by him. For it also agrees with this, that the *πάλιν προφητεῦσαι* of John in no way stands out of connection with the book of fate including of itself the entire prophecy concerning what was to occur; but rather not only does xi. 1–13 belong in the series of the woes, but also all that from xi. 15 succeeds the trumpets, which by means of the seals, from the last of which they have proceeded, belongs to the sphere of the book of fate. And when the angel, who brings the little book, looks towards Jerusalem, ver. 2, it agrees with this, that the *most immediate* object of the new prophecy, ver. 11, is in fact Jerusalem (xi. 1 sq.); but the perspective opened, ver. 7, extends to the ultimate end; so that from the little book, in the fulness corresponding to ver. 11, there follow also the prophecies of ch. xii. sqq. Thus the little book which was brought to John opened, and was eaten by him, appears to be an inner instruction and interpretation given the seer concerning visions still impending, and which are to continue until the full end. And the more important the subjects of the prophecy that now follow, — for we come now to the proper goal, while all that precedes is only preparatory, — the more natural appears the new special preparation of the prophet.

Notes by the American Editor.

LXIII. Ver. 1. *ἄλλον ἄγγελον ἰσχυρόν.*

Alford: "This angel is not, and cannot be, our Lord himself. Such a supposition would, it seems to me, entirely break through the consistency of apocalyptic analogy. Throughout the book, angels are the ministers of the Divine purposes, and the carriers-out of the apocalyptic course of procedure, but are everywhere distinct from the Divine Persons themselves. In order to this their ministry, they are invested with such symbols and delegated attributes as beseem in each case the particular object in view; but no apparent fitness of such symbolical investiture to the Divine character should induce us to break through the distinction, and introduce indistinctness and confusion into the book. When St. John means to indicate the Son of God, he indicates him plainly; none more so. When these plain indications are absent, and I find the name *ἄγγελος* used, I must take leave to regard the agent as distinct from him, — however clothed, for the purpose of the particular vision, with his delegated power and attributes."

LXIV. Ver. 3. *μυκᾶται.*

The application of the word to thunder is very forcibly illustrated by the *μύκημα* in Æschylus, *Prometheus*, 1062: —

> "*μὴ φρένας ὑμῶν ἠλιθιώσῃ*
> *βροντῆς μύκημ' ἀτέραμνον.*"
>
> "Quickly from hence depart,
> Lest the relentless roar
> Of thunder stun your soul." — PLUMPTRE's Translation.

LXV. Ver. 6. *χρόνος οὐκέτι ἔσται.*

Stier: "The Greek word *χρόνος* applies equally to a long interval, a respite, a delay, a postponement; and we have already had several instances in which it has been so used, as, for instance, in ch. ii. 21, where we find it rendered '*space* to repent;' and ch. vi. 11, where it stands for a further period of rest and expectation. Therefore the meaning is simply this: that, whereas the angel with the seal demands an interval of time before the opening of the seventh seal, which interval is to be employed in sealing the servants of God, so this angel, on the contrary, denies any further space for repentance, any respite for the ungodly, before the sounding of the seventh trumpet. He affirms that stroke is to succeed stroke, and that, in a certain limited period, all will be finished." So, also, Beck, who, in illustration of this meaning of *χρόνος*, refers to its derivative *χρονίζειν*: Matt. xxiv. 48, "My lord *delayeth* his coming;" xxv. 5, "while the bridegroom *tarried*;" Heb. x. 37, "He that shall come will come, and will not *tarry*." "Space of time" is the uniform meaning of *χρόνος* both in the Apocalypse (ii. 21, vi. 11, x. 6, xx. 3) and the Gospel of St. John (v. 6, vii. 33, xii. 35, xiv. 9).

LXVI. Ver. 9. *πικρανεῖ τὴν κοιλίαν.*

J. Gerhard (quoted by Calov.): "The pleasure of the mouth is a symbol of the pleasure which the godly derive from the revelation of divine mysteries before they fully perceive them. The *dolor ventris* is a symbol of the pain which they derive from the consideration of the persecution to be described in the succeeding prophecy, which antichrist will exercise against the Church at the end of the world." Primasius: "When you have received it, you will be delighted by the sweetness of the Divine speech (Ps. xix. 15), the hope of promised salvation, and the charm of Divine justice. But you will experience the bitterness when this is to be preached to both devout and undevout." Stier: "The evangelizing to the prophets must always have been fraught with a certain degree of bitterness to human nature." Luthardt: "Bitter poison to the belly, i.e., to man so far as he belongs to this transitory world (cf. 1 Cor. vi. 13); but so far as he is God's, it is sweet joy (cf. Ps. xix. 11), for it is a word of judgment to the world, but redemption to the Church, which, with its mouth, preaches God."

CHAPTER XI.

Ver. 1. The interpolation *καὶ ὁ ἄγγελος εἱστήκει* before *λέγων* (Elz.) is without all attestation. — *ἔγειρε.* So Lach., Tisch., in accordance with A, ℵ, 6, 7, al. Besides the var. *ἔγειραι* (Elz.), *ἔγειρον* also occurs (cf. Wetst.); both as an interpretation. — Ver. 4. *ἑστῶτες.* So A, C, $\aleph_1$, 2, 4, 6, al., Beng., Matth., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]. Without witnesses is the correction *ἑστῶσαι* (Elz.). — Ver. 5. *θέλει.* Only twice is the more grammatical, and therefore more suspicious, form *θελήσῃ* (Elz., Tisch. IX. [W. and H.]) found, viz., in A, ℵ; the first *θέλῃ* (Elz.) is entirely unwarranted. Properly Beng. already wrote *θέλει* both times. — Ver. 6. The decision as to whether, after a relatively compounded form like *ὁσάκις*, either *ἐάν* (so here Elz., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.], in accordance with A, ℵ) or *ἄν* (as C actually has it) is to be written, does not depend upon critical testimonies concerning a particular passage; cf. my notes on 1 John iii. 20. — Ver. 8. For *ἡμῶν* after *κύριος* (Elz.), Beng. already, in accordance with all the witnesses, substituted *αὐτῶν.* — Ver. 9. *ἀφίουσιν.* So A, C, ℵ, 12, 28, Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.], instead of the emendation *ἀφήσουσιν* (Elz., Beng., Griesb., Matth.). — Ver. 10. *εὐφραίνονται.* So A, C, ℵ, 12, 28, Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]. Modified, Elz.: *εὐφρανθήσονται* (Vulg.). — Ver. 11. *ἐν αὐτοῖς.* Correctly accepted by Lach., Tisch., from A, 18. Only for the purpose of avoiding harshness of construction with *εἰσῆλθεν* is it written: *αὐτοῖς* (C, 7, 17, Erasm., 1, 2, 3, Beng.), *ἐπ' αὐτούς* (Elz.), *εἰς αὐτούς* (ℵ, 2, 4, 6, al.). The var. *ἐπ' αὐτοις* (12) indicates what is correct. — Ver. 12. The reading *ἤκουσα* (Beng., Tisch.), supported by ℵ corr., 4, 6, 8, 9, al., Syr., Copt., Andr., al., deserves the preference to the certainly well-attested *ἤκουσαν* (Lach., Tisch. IX. [W. and H.]). See exposition. — Ver. 16. The art. *οἱ* is lacking before *εἰκ. τεσσ. πρεσβ.* in A, C, $\aleph_1$, Lach., and before *ἐν τ. θ. καθ.* in A, Lach. But, in the second place, the art. which, because of the retrospection to iv. 4, 11, especially cannot be absent in the first place, is to be recognized besides in the paraphrase *οἱ — κάθηνται* (C, 3, 4, al., Tisch. IX.). The omission also can be accounted for because of the similarity of the preceding syllable. Tisch. is right in supporting the rec., which has the article in both places. — Ver. 18. Instead of the dat., Lach. (small ed.) has written the accus. from *τοὺς ἁγίους* until *τοὺς μεγάλους*, of course according to A. But in his larger edition he has altered the reading, because C (also $\aleph_1$) offers only the two accusatives *τοὺς μικρ. καὶ τοὺς μεγ.* But the entirely senseless acc. can have its origin only in a slip in the MSS., which was occasioned possibly by the succeeding accus. — Ver. 19. The *ὁ* before *ἐν τ. ουρ.*, which is lacking in ℵ, Elz., Tisch. 1854, is found in A, C, 14 (Lach., Tisch. 1859 and IX. [W. and H.]).

The first part of the chapter, extending until ver. 14, — with which the chapter would more properly end, because the second part (ver. 15 sqq.) belongs throughout to ch. xii. sqq., — contains the first manifestation of the *πάλιν προφητεῦσαι*, which was committed to John at the close of ch. x. The

present προφητεία, moreover, is opened with the description of a significant act which John must perform in the vision — just as the ancient prophets, by significant acts, prophesied to the people.[1] With a measuring reed he must measure the temple, but not its outer court; for, as the heavenly voice immediately afterwards signifies, this is given to the heathen, who are for forty-two months (vv. 1, 2) to tread down the holy city. During this time — so further sounds the heavenly voice, from whose report John afterwards passes to his own prophetic discourse, ver. 11 — two witnesses of Christ shall come forth as preachers of repentance, who, only after the completion of their testimony, shall be slain by the beast out of the abyss, and that, too, in Jerusalem, where, to the joy of the godless world, their unburied corpses shall lie exposed to view in the street (vv. 3–10) But after three days and a half these witnesses shall be revived by God, to the terror of their enemies, before whose eyes they shall be raised to heaven (vv. 11, 12). A mighty earthquake then destroys a tenth of the city, and kills seven thousand inhabitants; the survivors are converted (ver. 13). — With this the *second* woe[2] is at an end; the *third* cometh quickly.

Ver. 1. Καὶ ἐδόθη μοι. By whom, remains just as undetermined as viii. 2, vi. 11. De Wette, Ew. ii., think of the angel of ch. x., who, however, has fulfilled there that to which he was called; Beng.[3] refers it to Christ, but to this, ver. 3 (μαρτ. μου) does not constrain. — κάλαμος ὅμοιος ῥάβδῳ. That a reed serves as a μέτρον,[4] is to a certain extent explained as to its form, by its resemblance to a rule. — λέγων, without construction, as iv. 1. Of course, the giver of the κάλαμος is meant; but it is incorrect, if one, as even Beng., regard the κάλαμος as the formally determined subject, and then by metonymy reaches its giver. — ἐγειρε καὶ μέτρησον. From the ἐγειρε it does not follow, that previously John was "in another posture of body,"[5] perhaps kneeling; the ἐγειρε — otherwise than in Mark v. 41; John v. 8; Luke v. 23 — corresponding to the Heb. קוּם,[6] is only excitatory with respect to the closely connected καὶ μετρ.[7] — It is not the purpose of the measuring, as the antithesis in ver. 2 undoubtedly shows, to make visible the relations of space, which, besides, is not conceivable in the measuring of the προσκυνοῦντες, — as in Ezek. xl. 1 sqq. the temple-building beheld by the prophet in its completion was measured in all its parts, because he is to learn its dimensions accurately,[8] — but just as in Am. vii. 7[9] that is measured which was destroyed, with respect to what is to be exempted from destruction, so John must here *measure* what is mentioned in ver. 1; because this is to be exempted from the destruction to which what is *not* measured (ver. 2) is abandoned, and is therefore to be preserved. In this formal understanding, Grot., Eichh., Ew., De Wette, Lücke, Hengstenb., etc., agree, much as they diverge from one another in

[1] 1 Kings xxii. 11; Isa. xx. 2; Jer. xix. 1 sqq. Cf. also Acts xxi. 11. Knobel, *Proph.*, i. 420 sqq.

[2] Cf. ix. 13 sqq.

[3] Cf. also Ew.

[4] Cf. Ezek. xl. 3: קְנֵה הַמִּדָּה; LXX.: κάλαμος μέτρου. Cf. Rev. xxi. 15.

[5] Beng.

[6] Num. x. 35; LXX.: ἐξεγέρθεις. Ps. iii. 8; LXX.: ἀνάστα. Mic. vi. 1; LXX.: ἀνάστηθι.

[7] Cf. Ew., De Wette, etc.

[8] Cf. Rev. xxi. 15 sqq.; also Zech. ii. 5 sqq. is similar.

[9] Cf. Hab. iv. 6.

its more detailed interpretation. It is, therefore, incorrect to find the intention of the new building in the measuring; whether in Bengel's sense, who here finds a confirmation of Ezek. xl., viz., the prophecy of the building of the temple of Ezekiel at Jerusalem actually to occur at the end of days; or in the sense of the allegorists, who understand the ναὸς τ. θ. of the true Church of Christ, and refer to its glorious new building, in connection with which the old Protestant expositors[1] regard the destruction of that which was consecrated (vv. 2, 13), as the Roman-Catholic degeneration, Jerusalem (ver. 8) as papal Rome; while the Catholics have in view the removal of the O. T. sanctuary, and the separation of wicked members of the Church, ver. 2.[2] See in general on ver. 13. — τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ. That part of the entire ἱερόν which contained the holy of holies, the holy place, and the porch; the proper temple-building,[3] in distinction from the entire space of the outer courts, cf. ver. 2. Incorrectly, Weiss:[4] "The congregation of believing Jews." — τὸ θυσιαστήριον. Only the altar of incense can be meant; since only this, and not the altar of sacrifice,[5] stood in the ναός.[6] For the argument of Hengstenb., that the ναός itself is to be understood figuratively of the Christian Church, because here the altar of incense in the same is removed, there is no occasion. But, also, on the other side, the argument of De Wette is unsuitable, that in vi. 9, viii. 3, what is said pertains not to the altar of sacrifice, which does not occur at all in the Apoc., but to the altar of incense; for since the ναὸς τ. θ. (ver. 1) is different from the ναὸς τ. θ. ὁ ἐν τ. οὐρανῷ (ver. 19), just so little has the θυσιαστήριον (ver. 1) to do with the *heavenly* altar, viii. 3, vi. 9. — καὶ τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας ἐν αὐτῷ, viz., τῷ ναῷ. Vitr. refers αυτῷ to θυσιαστ., and explains the ἐν by *apud*, since he interprets τ. προσκυν. by metonymy:[7] "the *place* in which the people were accustomed to adore God," and thus finally derives "the court of the Israelites." To this view, conflicting with the idea of the ναός, and with ver. 2, — which, besides, appears entirely confused by the fact that Vitr.[8] understands by the θυσιαστ. properly Christ, — he comes in order not to be compelled to conceive of the προσκυνοῦντες in the ναός, and at the altar found therein as exclusively priests, of whom many of the older Catholics, as C. a Lap, alone think. But as certainly as also the ναὸς τ. θ. is to be sought in Jerusalem (ver. 8), and the whole chapter is to be referred to the impending destruction of the city,[9] just so certainly does the position of those προσκυνοῦντες in the ναός itself appear as one of the ideal features, which explain the whole prophecy, and extend it to the sphere of a mere foretelling of a future event. That John beholds true believers from Israel transferred to the ναὸς τ. θ., otherwise standing open only to priests, is interposed because of his knowledge of the priestly character of all believers, Jews and Gentiles.[10] But as in ch. vii. he reports the *sealing* of believers out of Israel, as a necessary preparation for the judgment impending over Israel; so here, where the judgment breaks upon

[1] Par., Vitr., etc.
[2] C. a Lap., Stern.
[3] Matt. xxiii. 35, xxvii. 51.
[4] *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1869, p. 30.
[5] Grot., Vitr., Hengstenb.
[6] Eichh., Heinr., De Wette, Stern, Ebrard.
[7] Cf. also Grot.
[8] Cf. Zeg., etc.
[9] See on ver. 13.
[10] i. 6, v. 10. Cf. also vii. 15.

Israel those believers together with the proper dwelling of God are *measured*, just as he protects the *ναὸς τ. θ.* before its sinking in judgment.[1] [See Note LXVII., p. 332.]

Ver. 2. *Καὶ τὴν αὐλὴν τὴν ἔξωθεν, κ.τ.λ.* Incorrectly, Luther: "The inner choir," after a bad variation. Also Vitr., Ewald,[2] Züll., object not only to the expression, but also to what was said in ver. 1, since they conceive of *τ. αὐλ. τὴν ἔξωθεν τοῦ ναοῦ* in the sense of *τ. αὐλ. τὴν ἐξωτέραν τ. ν.*, and distinguish[3] an outer and an inner court, the latter of which, as belonging to the *ναός*, is measured with it. But the expression *ἔξωθ. τ. θ.*[4] confirms rather the idea given, ver. 1, of the *ναός* alone to be measured, i.e., the proper temple-building, outside of which the *αὐλή*, i.e., the entire space of the court, lies.[5] Arbitrarily, the *αὐλή* is interpreted by Weiss: "the congregation of unbelieving Jews." — *ἐκβαλε ἔξω.* The *casting out*, viz., beyond the reach of that which is to be measured, is determined, according to the sense as well as the form of the idea, by the parallel addition, *καὶ μὴ αὐτὴν μετρήσῃς*;[6] yet in the significant expression[7] the point must not be overlooked, which Eichh. alone, and without the textual reference to the boundaries of the space to be measured, in his unhappy paraphrase makes equivalent to "declare profane."[8] — *ὅτι ἐδόθη τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, for it is given to the Gentiles*, viz., by the Divine decree; as the immediately following fut. *πατήσουσι*, which describes the impending fulfilment of this decree, unambiguously declares. Entirely in violation of the context, Beng. remarks that the Gentiles, on account of whose immensity, i.e., innumerableness,[9] the outer court shall not be measured, shall at one day worship there. Improper also is the mingling of the idea, that the bloody sacrificial service at the altar of burnt offerings is not to be maintained:[10] it is intended by this, only that according to the Divine decree, the Gentiles shall *tread* (*πατήσουσι*, Luke xxi. 24) the court and the entire holy city.[11] Allied with this is the determination of the *καιροὶ ἐθνῶν* by the schematic temporal specification: *μῆνας τεσσαράκοντα καὶ δύο*, i.e., 3½ years,[12] according to the type of the treading down of the holy city and the sanctuary by Antiochus Epiphanes.

Ver. 3. *κ. δώσω τοῖς δυσὶν μάρτυσίν μου.* The object of *δώσω* follows here, not in the form of the infin.,[13] but is described, according to the Hebrew way, in the succeeding clause, *καὶ προφητ.* Formally and materially incorrect are the additions to *δώσω*, "constancy and wisdom,"[14] "the holy city,"[15] which are expressly rejected already by Vitr. Unnecessarily, although in fact not unsuitably, De Wette supplies "direction and power." — The art. *τοῖς* allows us to think only of two definite witnesses, otherwise known already, who, as the entire description until ver. 12 establishes, are personal individuals, but

[1] Cf. also De Wette, Lücke (p. 354).
[2] Cf. Gött., *Gel. Anz.*, 1861, p. 1013.
[3] Cf. Ezek. xl. 17 sqq.
[4] Cf. xiv. 20; Mark vii. 15.
[5] De Wette, Hengstenb., Ebrard.
[6] Beng., Ewald, De Wette, Hengstenb., Ebrard.
[7] Cf. Matt. viii. 12; John ix. 34 sqq., xii. 31; 3 John 10.
[8] Cf. Vitr.: "*Excommunicate.*"
[9] vii. 4, 9.
[10] Against De Wette, etc.
[11] Cf. Matt. iv. 5.
[12] = 3½ *καιροί*, Dan. vii. 25, xii. 7; Rev. xii. 14.
[13] As vi. 4, vii. 2.
[14] N. de Lyra, C. a Lap.
[15] Beza.

not "allegories of potencies."[1] The witnesses are meant[2] to be witnesses of Christ (*μάρτ. μου*),[3] which accordingly is understood in general of itself, because, as all true *προφητεία* proceeds from Christ,[4] so also is it actually directed to Christ;[5] but here it is especially applicable, because the witnesses come forth as preachers of repentance during an essentially Messianic visitation of judgment, and, besides, have to suffer from the same hostility as that by which the Lord himself is brought to the cross, ver. 8. But from this it does not follow[6] that Christ himself is to be regarded as speaking;[7] but the heavenly voice[8] speaks only in Christ's name. — *ἡμέρας χιλίας διακοσίας ἑξήκοντα.* The specification of the forty-two months, ver. 2, after the days, shows that daily, during this whole time, the prophetic speech of the two witnesses is heard. — *περιβ. σάκκους.* They are thus, above all things, preachers of repentance; for the penitential garb,[9] which they themselves have adopted,[10] puts before the eyes of the hearers what the prophetic testimony demands.

Ver. 4. The two witnesses of Christ (ver. 3) are further characterized in their nature and calling, and that, too, from Zech. iv.; for the definite art., *αἱ δύο ἐλ., αἱ δύο λυχν.*, points back to this, as the entire verse is based upon the sense and expression of Zech. iv. There Zech. beholds a golden candlestick with seven lamps, the symbol of the Church of God,[11] besides two olive-trees, to the right and left of the candlestick, which receives from them its oil. The two *ἐλαῖαι* (LXX.) designate, besides the *λυχνία*, "two anointed ones that stand by the Lord of the whole earth;"[12] viz., the two defenders and guardians of the theocracy given by God, — Zerubbabel and the high priest Joshua;[13] but the symbol represents that only by the Spirit of God, and not by man's own power, the restoration of the kingdom of God can be effected, ver. 6. With this symbol of Zech., John agrees when he designates the two witnesses of Christ as *αἱ δύο ἐλαῖαι*, and as *ἐνώπιον τοῦ κυρίου τῆς γῆς ἑστῶτες.* The latter expression, whose harsh incorrectness (*αἱ — ἑστῶτες*) is explicable by the reference to the persons represented under the symbols of *ἐλαῖαι* and *λυχνίαι*,[14] designates as little as the corresponding words in Zech. the two witnesses as representatives of the Church against the world,[15] but as servants of God,[16] who is here called, accordingly, the Lord of the world,[17] because he shall establish the fact that he is the Almighty, who sends his servants into their office, and protects them against all enemies, ver. 5, and to the terror of their enemies can glorify[18] the *κατοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*, ver. 10 sqq. Deviating, however, from Zech., John designates the two witnesses, not only as two *ἐλαῖαι*, but also as two *λυχνίαι*. He, of course, derives this

[1] Ebrard, who will in no way concede that they are symbols of individuals.
[2] Ewald, De Wette, etc.
[3] Cf. ver. 8: *ὁ κύριος αὐτων.*
[4] Cf. xix. 10.
[5] Cf. x. 7.
[6] Beng., Hengstenb., Ebrard.
[7] Cf., on the other hand, the *ὁ κύρ. αὐτῶν* (ver. 8).
[8] Cf. xxii. 7.
[9] Jer. iv. 8; Jon. iii. 5; Matt. xi. 21.
[10] Cf. Matt. iii. 4.
[11] Cf. Rev. i. 20.
[12] LXX.: *παρεστήκασι κυρίῳ πάσης γῆς.*
[13] Cf. iii. 1 sqq.
[14] Cf. v. 13. Winer, p. 499.
[15] Against Ebrard, who understands the אֲדוֹן כָּל־הָאָרֶץ as the Persian ruler of the world, and accordingly, in this passage, the *κύριος τῆς γῆς* as "the Lord of this world."
[16] Rev. viii. 2. Cf. Isa. vi. 1.
[17] Cf., on the other hand, ver. 13.
[18] Cf. Beng.

symbolical idea from Zech., but gives it another application; for what is said here is neither concerning the kingdom of God in itself, nor its upbuilding through Christ's two witnesses, but concerning a judgment upon "the holy city," during which the two witnesses preach repentance, and that, too, in vain, ver. 7 sqq. In no respect have the two witnesses aught to do with the preservation of the temple.[1] The idea of the one λυχνία in the sense of Zech. has therefore no place here. But John comprehends the symbol of the λυχνίαι in essentially the same significance as that of the ἐλαῖαι, when, precisely in the sense of Zech. iv. 6, he portrays what was just before expressed in clear words (δώσω τοῖς μάρτ. μ. καὶ προφητεύσουσιν); viz., that the efficiency of the two witnesses depends upon the Divine Spirit, not upon their own power, and hence becomes truly prophetic. John, therefore, describes the prophetic character of the two witnesses of Christ as like those two anointed ones in Zech.; but that he will not express the identity of the persons, nor designate the two witnesses as Zerubbabel and Joshua, who then must be regarded as repeated, follows partly from the deviation from Zech., and partly from other specifications in the context, ver. 3, ver. 5 sqq.[2]

Ver. 5 sq Description of the miraculous power with which the two witnesses are furnished in order, until their testimony is finished,[3] to ward off their enemies, and to attest their divine commission. The particular features of the description, viz., ver. 6, are derived from the histories of Elias and Moses. Even this retrospective allusion, acknowledged by all expositors, to the miracles of those ancient prophets which are in no way understood allegorically, of itself renders it in the highest degree improbable that the description here is meant to be allegorical; but also the individual expressions of the text guard against the "spiritual" interpretation, as it has been applied from Primas and Beda to Hengstenb. and Ebrard. — Whether in ver. 5 (πῦρ ἐκπορεύεται ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτῶν, κ.τ.λ.) there be an allusion to 2 Kings i. 10 sqq., where Elijah calls down fire *from heaven* which consumes his enemies,[4] remains uncertain; the parallel with Jer. v. 14[5] is more probable, but in connection with this the different character of the two passages dare not be overlooked. In Jeremiah the *words* of God are mentioned, and how when given in the mouth of the prophet they are like fire; just as it is said in Sir. lxviii. 1: ἀνέστη Ἠλιας προφήτης ὡς πῦρ, καὶ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ ὡς λαμπὰς ἐκαίετο.[6] In this passage, however, nothing is said of *God's words* coming *like fire* from the mouth of the prophet,[7] but only of fire which proceedeth from his mouth. What is said in Jer. v. 14, by way of comparison, appears here, just as above, ix. 17, in dreadful reality; and that the words πῦρ ἐκπορ. ἐκ τ. στόμ. αὐτ. are, nevertheless, meant figuratively, follows from their *deadly*[8] effect described immediately afterwards in the parallel clause, which, besides, is expressly referred by the οὕτως to the fire; for this οὕτως[9]

[1] Ver. 1, wherein many erroneously find the new building of the Christian Church symbolized.

[2] See on ver. 13. [3] Cf. ver. 7 sqq.

[4] Ewald, De Wette, etc.

[5] Beng., Hengstenb., etc.

[6] "Then stood up Elias the prophet as fire, and his word burned like a lamp."

[7] Against Beda, N. de Lyra, Aret., Par., Calov., Hengstenb., Ebrard. Cf. Grot.: "Their prayers excite God's wrath."

[8] Cf. ix. 18. [9] Cf. Sir. xlviii. 3.

says: "By the fire proceeding out of their mouth;"[1] and designates the punishment corresponding to the guilt of the *θέλειν ἀδικῆσαι*.[2] But if the *πῦρ* is understood figuratively, the *ἀποκτανθῆναι* must then be referred to the fact that to unbelievers the gospel is a savor of death unto death; for the *ἀδικῆσαι* must also then be figurative no less than the entire succeeding statement. The allegorists are, also, mostly consistent in this, but they arrive at the most wonderful interpretations. In the "power to shut heaven, that it rain not," ver. 6, the two witnesses are like Elijah;[3] even the specification of time here corresponds, as the days of their prophetic employment during which it is not to rain,[4] agree, according to ver. 3, with the three and a half years during which Elijah kept the heaven shut.[5] The further "power over the waters (*ἐπί*)[6] to turn them to blood," the two witnesses have in common with Moses;[7] the last words also, *καὶ πατάξαι τὴν γῆν ἐν πάσῃ πληγῇ*, *κ.τ.λ.*, contain a retrospective view to the *plagues* with which Moses *smote* the Egyptians,[8] although unlimited power is given both witnesses "to smite the earth with all plagues as often as they will." These decided words once more make it manifest in the most definite way, that the issuing of fire from the mouth of the witnesses, the closing of the heaven, and the turning of water into blood,[9] are clearly particular *plagues* of the kind inflicted by Elijah and Moses. If we are not to interpret 1 Kings xvii., Jas. v. 17, Exod. vii. sqq., allegorically, we must abide also in this passage by the literal sense, yet must not deduce therefrom that "the power of the keys"[10] is here ascribed the two witnesses, in virtue of which they close the heaven spiritually, and hold back the spiritual rain of the gospel,[11] cause bloodshed to come from the gospel,[12] or — if the *ὕδατα* which are turned into blood be understood as the waters out of which the antichristian beast (i.e., the papacy) arises — could excite the conflicts between popes and antipopes.[13] This kind of consequent allegorizing was doubtful already to Grot., who, therefore, tries to escape with the vague explanation, "There is nothing so great which they do not obtain on asking from God."[14]

Ver. 7. *ὅταν τελέσωσι.* "When they shall have finished."[15] — *τὸ θηρίον τὸ ἀναβαῖνον ἐκ τῆς ἀβύσσου.* Only the infernal nature of the beast is to be learned from his rising out of the abyss,[16] and his definitely antichristian character; further, from his contending against the witnesses of Christ,[17] and overcoming and slaying them. The more detailed explanation of the beast, John himself does not give until chs. xiii. and xvii. The mention of the beast in this passage is undoubtedly proleptical,[18] inasmuch as the concrete idea of the antichristian power under the definite form of the beast from

[1] Ew., Züll.
[2] Beng., De Wette, Hengstenb.
[3] 1 Kings xvii. 1.
[4] Concerning the accus. *τὰς ἡμέρας τ. προ. αὐτ.*, cf. Winer, p. 215.
[5] Jas. v. 17.
[6] Cf. vi. 8, where the accus. follows.
[7] Exod. vii. 19.
[8] Cf. Exod. viii. 2, 16 sqq., ix. 15, xi. 1.
[9] Cf. also viii. 8.
[10] Beda.
[11] N. de Lyra, Vitr., Calov., Hengstenb., Ebrard.
[12] Vitr.
[13] Cf. Calov.
[14] See on ver. 13.
[15] Cf. Winer, p. 289.
[16] Cf. ix. 1, 11.
[17] Cf. xiii. 7.
[18] De Wette, etc.

the abyss, which is presupposed as known by the definite art. τὸ θηρ., proceeds first from chs. xiii., xvii.; meanwhile, not only is the idea of his Antichristian nature already to a certain extent intelligible from the entire context, but also the form of the description of the beast from the example of Dan. vii., to which the interpolation in Cod. A expressly refers.

Vv. 8–10. As the slaying of the two witnesses could not occur[1] until they had fulfilled their mission, so the Almighty Lord[2] here allows dishonor to be shown their dead bodies, only in order afterwards to glorify them the more, ver. 11. — τὸ πτῶμα αὐτῶν. The sing.[3] is regarded collectively;[4] "that which has fallen of them," i.e., their corpses. — ἐπὶ τῆς πλατείας τῆς πόλεως τῆς μεγάλης. On the street, in the place where in the public exercise of their μαρτυρία they are slain, they remain lying unburied,[5] the most ignominious outrage even according to the feeling of the Gentiles,[6] who here are represented as instruments of the beast of the abyss from the fact that they inflict such an outrage upon Christ's witnesses, ver. 9, and rejoice at this, ver. 10. — That "the *great city*" is identical with the holy city where the ναὸς τοῦ θεοῦ stands, ver. 1 sqq., and, therefore, is none other than Jerusalem, is evident already from the connection; just as unambiguously is this declared in ver. 8, first in the spiritual designation of the same as Sodom and Egypt, then especially in the words ὅπου καὶ ὁ κύριος αὐτῶν ἐσταυρώθη. The *spiritual* designation (καλ. πνευματικῶς) expresses, in distinction from the proper historical name, the spiritual nature of the city; but the juxtaposition of the two names, Sodom and Egypt, shows that reference is not made here to individual relations,[7] but to that wherein Sodom and Egypt are essentially alike, viz., entire enmity to the true God, his servants, and his people. As already the ancient prophets called Jerusalem, in express terms, Sodom,[8] or a sister of Sodom,[9] they wished not so much to characterize individual sins, as rather to designate them radically from the perverted position of the people to their God. So here the city wherein the witnesses of Christ are slain, and lie unburied on the street, and wherein also the Lord was crucified, is spiritually designated by both anti-theocratic names, because its antichristian hostility to the Lord is to be represented as against his witnesses.[10] But the pneumatic designation of the city gives also the answer in harmony with the context to the question in hand as to why the city is called here, not, as ver. 2, the holy, but "the *great*." Aret., Calov., and many of the older Protestants, have concluded from a comparison with xvi. 19, xviii. 15, etc., that also in this passage the great city is nothing but Babel, i.e., Papal Rome. Ebrard and other allegorists wish from this designation to prove at least that not the actual Jerusalem, but that which is allegorically meant, i.e., the secularized church, is to be understood. The reply of De Wette, that John could no longer call the city holy after its "profanation,"

[1] Cf., on this idea, the ἐδόθη αὐτῷ (xiii. 7).
[2] Cf. ver. 4.
[3] Cf. ver. 9, the plural.
[4] De Wette.
[5] Cf. ver. 9.
[6] Cf. Winer, *Rwb.*, i. 172 sq.
[7] Against Hengstenb.: "Αἴγυπτος refers to religious corruption, Σόδομα to immoral practices." Otherwise in Vitr., etc.
[8] Isa. i. 9 sqq.
[9] Ezek. xvi. 48.
[10] Cf. Ewald, Bleek, De Wette.

and yet "wanted to designate it as a chief city containing a large population, ver. 13, and at the same time many Gentiles, warriors, and others," especially in its second part, is not properly satisfactory. The reason is more probable that it is impossible in one breath to call the city holy, and Sodom and Egypt, while the τ. μεγάλης points in like manner as with respect to the city, which in ch. xvi. sqq. bears the spiritual name of Babel, to the city's greatness and power as the vain foundation of its godless security and arrogant enmity against the Lord and his witnesses calling to repentance. — That the concluding words of ver. 8, ὅπου, κ.τ.λ., dare not be conceived of as a mere notice of locality, Ebrard properly mentions; but from this the impossibility does not result that the significance of the πνευματικῶς with καλεῖται extends also to the clause ὅπου — ἐσταυρώθη, as Hengstenb. and Ebrard still assert, as, like the old Protestant allegorists, they refer it to the spiritual crucifixion of the Lord in the secularized church,[1] a conception against which already the aor. ἐσταυρώθη, pointing to the definite fact of the crucifixion, is arrayed, — but only the necessity follows for seeking the correct reference of that clause in the pragmatism of the context. Again, the text itself shows this, partly by the καὶ before ὁ κύρ. αὐτ., partly by the expression ὁ κύρ. αὐτων. Both belong inwardly together; as the two witnesses, so also their Lord was there slain, crucified; the servants have suffered the same thing as their[2] Lord.[3] This is accordingly made prominent, because from this it becomes clear that the antichristian enmity of the great city remains always the same; with the same hatred as that wherewith they formerly once brought the Lord there to the cross, they now slay the two witnesses just because they are *his* witnesses. But still in another respect is the allusion to the crucifixion of the Lord significant, viz., with respect to the judgment announced. For even in their days,[4] the city shows the same impenitent hostility, on account of which the Lord himself already had proclaimed its judgment.[5] — Ver. 9. The subj. to βλέπουσιν lies directly in the partitively formed expression ἐκ τῶν λαῶν, in connection with which a τινὲς is not to be supplied.[6] In like manner, the subject is partitively formed, John xvi. 17, the object, Matt. xxiii. 34; in the simple gen., without ἐκ, the partitive obj. is found; e.g., iii. 9. — From peoples, kindreds, etc. (v. 9), Jews and Gentiles (cf. ver. 2), many then have assembled in Jerusalem;[7] these see the indignity (ver. 8) ἡμέρας τρεῖς καὶ ἡμίσυ, "*three days and a half.*"[8] The schematic significance of this date can only be mistaken, and a definite chronological prophecy be found here, if the specifications of time of vv. 2, 3, also be taken literally,[9] which then of course is ill adapted to the further view of the *allegorical* character, and the reference of the whole to the antichristian period at the end of the world. All those have felt the schematic nature of the three and a half days, who have thought in connection there-

[1] In the Papacy. Calov., etc.

[2] The reference of the αὐτῶν to the inhabitants of Jerusalem (Ew. ii.) is ingenious, but violates the pragmatism of the statement, which also testifies to the *passive* form ἐσταυρώθη.

[3] Cf. Matt. x. 24 sqq.; John xv. 20.

[4] Cf. ver. 2 sqq.

[5] Cf. Luke xix. 41 sqq.

[6] Against Ebrard.

[7] Beng., De Wette, etc.

[8] Accus. of duration, as ver. 3.

[9] Beng.

with of only a short time;[1] but that just three and a half days are named cannot be explained by an allusion to the *three* days during which the Lord lay in the grave;[2] also not with Ewald: "Longer than it is proper for a dead person to be left unburied, especially if we consider that from the nature of the land the dead should be buried sooner, so as not to become offensive;" but only from the analogy of the three and a half years, ver. 2 sq.[3] — *ἀφίουσι.* The form, like the *ἤφιεν*, Mark i. 34, xi. 16, from the stem *ἀφίω.*[4] — *τεθῆναι εἰς μνῆμα.* Cf. Luke xxiii. 53, 55; Matt. xxvii. 60. — From the fact that in ver. 10 it is said, "they that dwell upon the earth" rejoice over them,[5] it has been inferred[6] that not the actual Jerusalem is to be regarded as the scene, but the allegorically so-called great city, Papal Rome, or rather the Romish Papacy, which actually extends over the whole earth. Improperly; for the strange attempt in this way to present the entire mass of all individuals dwelling on earth as spectators would thereby miscarry. In the expression *οἱ κατοικ. ἐπὶ τ. γ.*, the question is not with respect to the numerical mass, but the generic idea;[7] the self-evident limitation to the *κατοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*[8] found in the city, as representatives of the entire class, the text itself gives by accounting for their joy, to which they testify by mutual presents as on festivals,[9] as follows: *ὅτι οὗτοι οἱ δύο προφῆται ἐβασάνισαν τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.* The *βασανισμός*[10] on the part of the two prophetic witnesses, which in no way can be referred to the inner pain[11] excited by their preaching of repentance,[12] was perceptible only to the enemies in the city, who just as such represent the entire class of dwellers upon earth.

Ver. 11. sq. The resuscitation, and ascension to heaven, of the two witnesses. *πνεῦμα ζωῆς*, "A spirit of life." Cf. Gen. vi. 17, ii. 7.[13] Incorrectly, Hengstenb.: The spirit of life. — *ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ.* "Immediately, miraculously."[14] — *εἰσῆλθεν ἐν αὐτοῖς.* "Came" (into them, and remained) "in them." Cf. Luke ix. 46; Winer, p. 385. — *καὶ ἔστησαν ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας αὐτῶν.* The more clearly this is meant as a sign of revivification,[15] and the more definitely it is said, ver. 12, *ἀνέβησαν εἰς τ. ουρ. ἐν τ. νεφ.*, the less is it to be urged that here the expression *ἐγείρεσθαι* or *ἀνάστασις* is *avoided.*[16] — *κ. φόβος μέγας, κ.τ.λ.* Concerning the expression, cf. Luke i. 12; concerning the thing itself, Matt. xxvii. 54. The resuscitation of the witnesses proved that the Lord, in whose name they came forth, has the power to avenge the indignity shown his servants. — *καὶ ἤκουσα.* The reading *ἤκουσαν*, — approved also by Ew. ii., —

[1] Zeg., Hengstenb., etc.

[2] C. a Lap., Hengstenb.

[3] De Wette. Cf. also Hengstenb. and Ebrard, of whom, however, the latter concurs therein with Beng., etc., in that he also understands the time of antichrist at the end of the world, by conceiving of the one thousand two hundred and sixty days (ver. 3), at whose close the three and one-half days (ver. 9) fall, as the period of the Church from the destruction of Jerusalem until the conversion of Israel before the end of the world.

[4] Cf. Winer, p. 77.

[5] *ἐπ' αὐτοῖς*; viz., so far as the witnesses are slain, and lie ignominiously upon the street.

[6] Calov., Vitr., etc.

[7] Cf. vi. 10, iii. 10.

[8] Cf. ver. 9: *ἐκ τῶν λαῶν, κ.τ.λ.*

[9] Cf. Neh. viii. 10, 12; Esth. ix. 22. Cf. Winer, *Rwb.*, i. 482.

[10] ix. 5. [11] Hengstenb.

[12] Beng., Ew., De Wette.

[13] Beng., etc.

[14] Beng.

[15] Cf. 2 Kings xiii. 21; Ezek. xxxvii. 10.

[16] Against Ebrard, who finds in this an indication of its figurative significance.

whereby the same subject is to be understood as in *ἀνέβησαν*, cannot be defended by a comparison with the entirely heterogeneous passage, John v., 28.[1] A declaration directed to the witnesses would be designated after the manner of vi. 11.[2] The *καὶ ἤκουσα* properly supported by Beng., Ew. i., De Wette, is incomparably more suitable; also in vi. 6, ix. 13, John hears voices directed to others, whose consequences he then beholds. The call *ἀνάβατε ὧδε*[3] finds its fulfilment, immediately afterwards, before the eyes of the enemies: *καὶ ἀνέβησαν, κ.τ.λ.* In this final glorification, the two witnesses are less like Elijah,[4] than their Lord himself,[5] as also their death was expressly compared with his crucifixion, ver. 8.

Ver. 13. At the same time a great earthquake destroys the tenth part of the city, slays seven thousand inhabitants, and thus effects the conversion of the rest. — *ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ*, viz., that in which what is reported in ver. 12 occurred.[6] With the glorification of the witnesses coincides the vengeance upon their enemies, and those of the Lord. — *σεισμὸς μέγας*. That the earthquake is intended just as literally as in vi. 12,[7] and is not some dreadful event to be discerned only from the fulfilment of the prophecy,[8] and that, in general, nothing allegorical is here said, follows from the further description of the effect of the earthquake; the *tenth* part of the city is thrown down, and seven thousand men (*ὀνόματα ἀνθρ.*, cf. iii. 4) are slain (*ἀπεκτάνθησαν*, in the same sense as the other plagues).[9] If the numerical specifications be regarded as something else than concrete forms, which by a certain measure make perceptible the idea of a relatively small injury,[10] we enter the province of conjecture. Ebrard wishes to "refer the tenth part of the city to the tenth part of the fourth world-power, over which the antichrist is to extend his dominion."[11] But, as by this arbitrary introduction of a prophecy so unlike this as that in ch. xvii , the antichristian character of the number *ten* is inferred, an embarrassment to the text is occasioned, since it designates the antichristian men slain by the number *seven*, a divine number. Yet here Ebrard aids with the conjecture, that this number may indicate "the servile imitation of divine relations of number on the part of the antichristian realm." — *καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ, κ.τ.λ.* Upon this large remainder of the inhabitants of the city, the Divine visitation is, therefore, not fruitless.[12] — *ἔδωκαν δόξαν*. A mark of conversion, xvi. 9; Jer. xiii. 16.[13] — *τῷ θεῷ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*. The expression, derived from the later books of the O. T.,[14] occurs in the N. T. only here and xvi. 11.[15] It is caused here by ver 13.[16] Without further reference, De Wette explains it: "the true, supreme God." But by the very fact that God carries his two witnesses to heaven, he shows himself as God of heaven.

[1] Hengstenb.
[2] Cf. also ix. 4.
[3] Cf. iv. 1.
[4] 2 Kings ii. 11.
[5] Cf. especially with the *ἐν τῇ νεφέλῃ* (Acts i. 9).
[6] De Wette.
[7] Cf. also Matt. xxvii. 51, xxviii. 2, where a similar inner connection of the earthquake with the death and resurrection of the Lord occurs.
[8] Ebrard.
[9] Cf. vi. 8, viii. 11, ix. 18.
[10] Cf. vi. 8, viii. 7 sqq., where the fourth or third are affected by a plague. So Ewald, De Wette, Lücke.
[11] Dan. vii. 24. Cf. Rev. xvii. 12 sq.
[12] Cf., on the other hand, ix. 20.
[13] Beng.
[14] Ezek. i. 2; Neh. i. 4 sq.; Dan. ii. 18.
[15] De Wette.
[16] Cf. Beng.

For the comprehension of the entire section, vv. 1–13, the text gives a completely secure standpoint by designating "the holy city" in which "the temple of God" stands, and which "the Gentiles shall tread under foot," vv. 1, 2, by the most unambiguous words as the city "where Christ was crucified," ver. 8. Already what is said in vv. 1, 2, suggests only Jerusalem; but the words of ver. 8 ὅπου — ἐσταυρώθη, are in themselves so simple, and have besides, by means of the historical aor., such immovable firmness in their reference to the definite fact of the crucifixion of the Lord, that no exposition can correspond with the text that conflicts with the norm given by ver. 8 and vv. 1, 2. And if the difficulties of exposition from the standpoint given by the context — viz., concerning the two witnesses (ver. 3 sqq.), and the relation of ver. 13 and vv. 1, 2, to the Lord's prophecies concerning the destruction of Jerusalem — were still greater than they are, without doubt the solution of the difficulties can be found only in the way indicated by the text itself. Highly characteristic of the force with which the text, especially by ver. 8, defends itself against the allegorical interpretation, are the concessions of the allegorists themselves. C. a Lap allegorizes like the older Protestants; but in order to avoid altogether the results of Protestant allegorizing, which regards the great city as Papal Rome, he mentions that ver. 8 allows us to think only of Jerusalem, and, therefore, in no way of Rome. Hengstenb., who interprets the entire section (vv. 1–13) allegorically of the secularized church, opens his observations on ver. 8 with the words: "The great city is Jerusalem." Tinius[1] does not know how to defend the allegorical interpretation as Rome, otherwise than by the conjecture that the contradictory words ὅπου καὶ ὁ κύριος αὐτων ἐσταυρώθη were *interpolated!*[2]

If by allegorizing, the prophecy be once withdrawn from the firm historical basis upon which, by ver. 8 and vv. 1, 2,[3] it puts itself, every limitation whereby the context itself determines the relation of prophecy is removed, and a proper refutation of the most arbitrary interpretations is no longer possible. How will an old Protestant or a modern allegorist prove that the exposition of N. de Lyra is incorrect, when by essentially the same allegorizing he infers that vv. 1, 2, were fulfilled when Pope Felix instituted the festival of church dedications? For, why should not κάλαμος signify just as well a sprinkling-brush as the word of God? And if the ναὸς τοῦ θεοῦ mean the true Church, why could not the witnesses coming forth for it be as well Pope Silverius and the Patriarch Mennas,[4] as the "*testes veritatis*," possibly the Waldenses, whose testimony in John Hus and Jerome of Prague was revived in Luther and Melanchthon?[5] Or, upon what exegetical foundation can it be proved that the beast from the abyss is not the imperial general Belisarius,[6] but the Pope?[7] The modern allegorists are inconsistent in not expressly adopting the special relations which the allegorical interpretation formerly knew how to find in a surprising way.[8] The modern

[1] *Die Off. Joh. — Allen verständlich gemacht*, Leipz., 1839.
[2] Cf. De Wette.
[3] Cf. Luke xxi. 24.
[4] N. de Lyra.
[5] Vitr., etc.
[6] N. de Lyra.
[7] Aret., Vitr., etc.
[8] Yet these ancient interpretations are not absolutely excluded; now and then they are

allegorists are harmonious with the ancient in the fundamental view of all decided points of the entire prophecy: that the temple of God which was measured means the true Church which is to be preserved, while the outer court and the city given to the heathen are wicked Christians; that Christ's two witnesses, their office, their miraculous powers, their suffering, their death, their resurrection and ascension, are to be understood "spiritually;" finally, that the earthquake (ver. 13) and its effect figuratively represent a visitation upon the degenerate Church. Ebrard regards the earthquake as a special fact, whose more accurate determination is impossible before the fulfilment of the prophecy. In the "spiritual" fundamental view, the Catholic allegorists, as C. a Lap., Stern, etc., also agree with Par., Vitr., Calov., Hengstenb., Ebrard. But differences immediately arise with the more accurate determinations, in which, however, when once the standpoint designated by the context itself is deserted, and the way of allegorizing is entered, the ancient Protestants proceed more correctly. The entire description of the two witnesses is so thoroughly personal, that it is more in harmony with the text to think of "the doctors of the Church,"[1] than of the "office of witness,"[2] or only of the testifying "potencies," law and gospel.[3] The slaying, the not burying, the awakening of witnesses, refers rather to the martyrdom of Savonarola and Hus, and the resuscitation of such witnesses in Luther and the other reformers,[4] than to the fact that law and gospel are regarded dead, and then again maintained.[5] Besides, if the dates, seeming to correspond so accurately, be taken in the sense of the old interpreters,[6] they could please at least by the *naïve* confidence in their consequences; while the modern allegorists, by the timidity with which they announce only vague generalities, betray their own insecurity and weakness.

From this form of allegorizing lately arising from a magical idea of foretelling the future, that form is distinguished which has been invented in the interest of a rationalistic conception of biblical prophecy, and which is, of course, very vigorous with respect to results obtained, but not at all in exegetical methods. This group of expositors[7] has in this the great excellence,

expressly advanced. Thus Rinck (p. 47) says, "Constance also is a part of that great city." A consistent return to the ancient Protestant allegorizing has been ventured upon again by Gräber.

[1] Calov., Vitr., etc.

[2] Hengstenb.

[3] Ebrard.

[4] Par., Vitr., Calov., etc.

[5] Ebrard.

[6] The one thousand two hundred and sixty days are taken by the older interpreters ("almost all of our writers" [Calov.]) as equal to one thousand two hundred and sixty years. Calov. reckons them from the time of Leo the Great to about the year 1700, in which a chief event bearing upon the overthrow of the degenerate, i.e., of the Romish, Church must occur. Cocceius reckons from the end of the third century until the treaty of Passau, 1552. Gravius (in Calov.) maintains three and one-half years, which he reckons from the year 1625, in which the Papists triumphed, until the appearance of Gustavus Adolphus. Brightman understands the three and one-half years which the Papists assembled at the Council of Trent, used in order to do away with the O. and N. T. (the two witnesses). The tenth part of the city, i.e., of the Papacy, which is overthrown, is, according to Cocceius, Protestant France; the seven thousand slain are the seven provinces which deserted from Spain. Most recently Gräber again has attempted such trifling expedients. The end of the one thousand two hundred and sixty days, i.e., years, he expected in 1859; then the dominion of the Turks at Jerusalem would come to an end.

[7] Grot., Wetst., Herd., Eichh., Heinr., etc.

that they hold firmly to the textual reference to Jerusalem. Grot., who has found already in the preceding visions the destruction of the city by Titus, refers (ch. xi.) to the times of Hadrian, who built a temple of Jupiter in the city, on the place *not* measured, — for John, of course, must measure the already destroyed temple, "because God was to preserve that *space* from the heathen on account of the memory of its ancient holiness." — The two witnesses are the two assemblies of Christians, a Hebrew and a Greek-speaking congregation at Jerusalem; the beast (ver. 7) is Barcocheba; ver. 13 describes the destruction of his party in the city, against which ver. 15 sqq. represents the suppression of the same outside of the city. According to Eichh., the ναὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, ver. 1, designates the worship of the one God, which is to be maintained even though the αὐλή, i.e., the pomp of ceremonies, be surrendered at the impending destruction of the city by Titus, described in ver. 15 sqq. The two witnesses are the high-priests Ananus and Jesus,[1] murdered by the Zealots (τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, ver. 2);[2] the earthquake is a scene of murder introduced by the Zealots; and the words κ. οἱ λοιποὶ, κ.τ.λ., he explains: "The good citizens of Jerusalem bore this slaughter with a brave mind, having professed this besides, viz., that it had occurred, not without God's knowledge, but by his permission."

The necessity of allegorical exposition, Hengstenb. has attempted to prove at length.[3] Against the fundamental view advocated by Bleek, Ew., Lücke, and De Wette, that ch. xi. refers to the still future destruction of Jerusalem, — whereby, on the one hand, those expositors maintain the harmony with the words of the Lord on the subject (cf. ver. 2, πατήσουσιν, with Luke xxi. 24), and, on the other hand, explain the difference that in this passage the proper ναός is to remain preserved, and, in general, the judgment (cf. ver. 13) is far milder than in Luke xxi., Matt. xxiv., by the patriotic feeling of John, who was unwilling to conceive of the entire holy city, together with the proper habitation of God, as surrendered to the Gentiles, Hengstenb. remarks: "Within the sphere of Holy Scripture, that pseudo-patriotism, that blind partiality for one's own people, is nowhere at home." This is so far entirely inapplicable, since patriotism and pseudo-patriotism are two very distinct things. Moses, Jeremiah, all the prophets, have, as true patriots, a holy sympathy with their people. Paul especially emphasizes (Rom. ix. 3) the patriotic point of the wish there made. Yea, the bitterness of the book eaten by John,[4] Hengstenb. himself has explained by a comparison with Ezek. iii. 14, from the sad contents of the prophecy to be announced. But if it were bitter to the ancient prophets to announce to their own people the Divine judgments, this not only testifies to their holy patriotic love, but, besides, makes us see how the entire prophetic character was a profoundly moral, and not a magical, overwhelming one, consuming the moral personality of the prophet. So also in John. If the prophecy, ch. xi. 1-3, according to vv. 1, 2, 8, undoubtedly refers to the actual Jerusalem, so in the bitterness to the prophet,[5] with which the judgment is ful-

[1] Cf. Joseph., *B. J.*, iv. 2 sqq.
[2] So also Herder.
[3] Cf., against him, Lücke, p. 825 sqq., and, besides, Bleek, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1855, p. 215 sqq.
[4] x. 9 sqq.
[5] x. 9 sq.

filled, vv. 1, 2, we must not fail to see genuine patriotism. But it is of course unsatisfactory when the difference between the prediction (xi. 1–13) and the corresponding fundamental prophecy of the Lord[1] is to be explained alone by John's patriotism;[2] while, more preposterously yet, Hengstenb. goes too far on the opposite side in attempting to defend John from pseudo-patriotism by imputing to him the view that the actual Jerusalem is the congregation of Satan. Hengstenb. is led to this misunderstanding[3] by the zeal with which he opposes not so much the view of Lücke, etc., as rather the opinion of Baur concerning the gross Judaism of the Apoc. But it is extremely incorrect to decide the views of Lücke and of Baur[4] as the same. Just by the false anti-Judaism which Hengstenb. ascribes to John, he breaks away the point from his apparently most important arguments for the allegorical exposition. He says, "John *everywhere* uses the Jewish only as a symbol and form of representation of the Christian; thus, also (ver. 1), he designates by the temple the Christian Church, and (ver. 8) by Jerusalem the degenerate Christian Church as a whole." This exegetical canon is just as incorrect as that stated in viii. 10, etc., that a star everywhere signifies a ruler. Yet, as a matter of course, it must appear already impossible for John, if he regards actual Judaism, the temple, the holy city, etc., without any thing further, as a congregation of Satan, to use these congregations of Satan, with their institutions, as a symbol of the true Church of Christ. But Hengstenb. does John the most flagrant injustice. Those who are Jews only as they call themselves such, but are the synagogue of Satan, he thoroughly distinguishes — in the sense of Rom. ix. 6 — from those who are such actually. To the latter belong the sealed *out of Israel*,[5] in distinction from those out of the Gentiles. Is the name of Israel (vii. 4 sqq.) a *symbol* of the Christian Church? and are the names of the tribes there *symbols* of Christian churches? Hengstenb., especially on xiv. 1 sqq., thinks that the constant Jewish symbolism cannot be mistaken, as there Mount Zion can be understood only symbolically. That is decidedly incorrect; but, on the other hand, the visionary locality where Christ is seen with his hosts is the actual Mount Zion, which, as a visionary locality, is as little understood *allegorically* as iv. 1, Heaven; iv. 6, the throne of God; xi. 15, xii. 1, Heaven; xiii. 1, the seashore, etc. But when Hengstenb. appeals to xx. 9 in order to prove that the "holy city," xi. 1, 2, is to be understood allegorically, he does something awkward, because the entire statement of ch. xx., which extends over the historical horizon, dare in no way be made parallel with the prophecy, xi. 1–13, which expressly (ver. 8, vv. 1, 2) indicates its historical relation. — Against the not allegorical explanation, Hengstenb. says further, that "we cannot understand how an announcement of the future fate of Jewish Jerusalem . . . should occur just at this place, hemmed in between the sixth and seventh trumpets, the second and third woes, which have to do only with

[1] Matt. xxiv.; Luke xxi.

[2] Against Lücke, etc.

[3] Cf. ii. 9.

[4] Cf. also Volkm.: "The Jewish seer has completely deceived himself in his hope for Jerusalem and the Jewish people. But let Luke xxi. 24, as a prediction of Christ, be suggested in connection with the expression in the Apoc., notwithstanding the entire destruction of the city entering therein."

[5] Ch. vii.

worldly power." The answer is immediately given, and that, too, not only from the methodical progress in itself of the Apoc. vision, — which Hengstenb. confuses by his view, in violation of the context, that xi. 1–13 occurs *between* the second and third woe, while what is here said belongs rather to the second woe, ver. 14,[1] — but also, as is equally decisive, in fullest harmony with the fundamental prediction of the Lord. — When Hengstenb. judges further that the account of the two witnesses is comprehensible only by an allegorical exposition, it is, on the one hand, to be answered, that the allegorizing obliteration of the definite features referring to personalities[2] ill harmonizes with the text, and, on the other hand, the non-allegorizing exposition must accept the difficulties, just as the text offers them, and attempt their explanation. — Finally[3] Hengstenb. mentions the testimony of Irenaeus, which places the composition of the Apoc. in the time after the destruction of Jerusalem, and must consequently prevent the expositor from accepting, in ver. 1 sqq., the existence of the temple and city, and regarding the destruction as future. Lücke, who, with the fullest right, places the self-witness of the Apoc. above the testimony of Irenaeus, and vindicates for the exegete the freedom required above all things by the text, acknowledges the possibility that, in case John wrote after the fall of the city, by a kind of fiction he might have represented this fact as future. Therefore the statement (*πατήσουσιν*, ver. 2) would at all events be future, and refer to the destruction of the city. But Bleek correctly denies even the possibility of conceiving of this passage according to the rule of such a fiction, to say nothing of its being entirely aimless.

The most immediate norm for the correct exposition resulting from the wording of the text itself, has already been asserted in opposition to the allegorists; viz., the reference to Jerusalem, ver. 8, vv. 1, 2, and to the judgment impending over this city (ver. 2, *πατήσουσιν*). Another no less important norm, to which also the phraseology, ver. 2 (*ἐδ. τοῖς ἔθνεσιν — πατήσουσιν*), points by its similarity with Luke xxi. 24, shows the essential agreement of our prediction with the fundamental prediction of the Lord.[4] For, just as the Lord himself places the final judgment in inner connection with the end of the world, — to such an extent, that apparently even an external chronological connection is expressed, — so John predicts the ultimate fulfilment (which is here represented in the seventh trumpet-vision, xi. 15 sqq.) in such a way that he begins with the judgment upon Jerusalem, xi. 1–13. After x. 7 sqq., he is now to announce the completion of the mystery of God. The completion itself does not occur, as in x. 7 also it is expressly said, until the time of the seventh trumpet (xi. 15 sqq.), in which also the third woe falls (cf. xi. 14); but the announcement committed to John begins, nevertheless, not

[1] Cf. the introductory observations on ch. x.

[2] See on ver. 13 sqq.

[3] The other observations of Hengstenb., that the beast (ver. 7) has, according to xiii. 7, 8, nothing to do with the Jewish, but with the holy, Jerusalem, and that the allegorical interpretation shows only that the prediction extends to us, carry with them their own answer. The beast does something antichristian in slaying the witnesses of Christ, and every thing biblical concerns us. Are we to interpret Luke xix. 41 sqq. allegorically, because what is there written pertains to us?

[4] Luke xxi.; Matt. xxiv.

first with xi. 15, but already at xi. 1. And what is here (vv. 1–13) predicted belongs to the second woe, and therefore stands in the connection of the series with the third, soon-coming woe.

No one would have thought of denying, in ver. 1–13, the reference afforded from the wording, and the analogy with the eschatological discourses of the Lord to the impending destruction of Jerusalem, and in order to do this, would have had to resort to allegorical explanation, if, on the other hand, the prediction of John did not deviate from that fundamental prediction, and the fact of the destruction had not in reality occurred, as the Lord, but not as John, had predicted. But just the latter difficulty brings with itself the solution; for it follows, from the peculiar deviations from Matt. xxiv., Luke xxi., that John, in his prophecy concerning Jerusalem, had an entirely different purpose from the Lord himself, and accordingly he puts his prophetic description of the impending act of judgment in a peculiar light, and paints it in other colors.[1] The Lord announces simply the definite fact of the destruction of the city;[2] he mentions Judah and Jerusalem, and describes how the Gentile enemies will build a rampart against it, plunder it, and not leave one stone upon another, a destruction which affected the dishonored temple no less than the holy city. According to the description of John, there would be only a period during the 3½ years of oppression known already from Daniel, in which the city and the court are trodden under foot by the Gentiles; the temple proper is preserved from all indignity and devastation. During this time, the two witnesses of Christ come forth as preachers of repentance, who, according to their nature and office, — not according to their individual personality, — are the two olive-trees *and candlesticks* (anointed ones) of whom Zech. spake, ver. 4; they are Moses and Elijah,[3] — not Enoch and Elijah,[4] who, as prophetic preachers of repentance, are thought of as having returned to the same desert, just as Elijah returned in the manifestation of John the Baptist.[5] But these were killed, and that, too, by the beast from the abyss, whose mention in this place — as it properly belongs only to the seventh trumpet — gives an indication for the conception of the ideal standpoint from which John regards the impending judgment upon Jerusalem in connection with its full and final development. No less significant is the hatred which the Gentiles present in the city — of

[1] Without foundation in the context, Weiss, a. a. O., p. 29, designates the meaning of the whole: "It is to be represented how, notwithstanding the impending destruction of Jerusalem, yet the final deliverance of a last remnant of the holy people, promised by all the prophets, is to occur" (in distinction from Rom. xi. 26: πᾶς Ἰσρ.). This theologumenon as such is entirely remote.

[2] Cf. also Luke xix. 41 sqq.

[3] Ver. 5 sqq. Cf. Matt. xvii. 1 sqq., De Wette, Lücke, Ew. ii., Hilgenf., etc.

[4] Stern, Ew. i. Beda already rejects this view disseminated in the Church fathers. An interesting reference to this passage is found in the Gospel of Nicodemus, P. ii. (*Desc. Chr. ad Inf.*, c. 9), where Enoch says of himself and Elijah: μέλλομεν ζῆσαι μέχρι τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος· τότε δὲ μέλλομεν ἀποσταλῆναι παρὰ θεοῦ ἐπὶ τῷ ἀντιστῆναι τῷ ἀντιχρίστῳ καὶ ἀποκτανθῆναι παρ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστῆναι καὶ ἐν νεφέλαις ἁρπαγῆναι πρὸς τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ὑπάντησιν ("We are to live until the completion of the world; then we are to be sent by God to withstand Antichrist, and to be slain by him, and after three days to be raised and snatched up in the clouds to meet the Lord") (*Ev. Apocr.*, ed. Tisch., Lips., 1853, p. 309).

[5] Cf. Matt. xvii. 12; Luke i. 17.

whom we are to think so preponderatingly in the expression *οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*, that the reference to the unbelieving Jews retires altogether into the background — show to the dead bodies of Christ's witnesses. Finally, in comparison with the fundamental prophecy of the Lord, it is significant for the distinct mode of contemplation by John, that here an earthquake, after the manner of the preliminary plagues described in the seal- and trumpet-visions, visits the city, destroys a part of it, and brings the survivors to repentance, in contrast with the plagues remaining fruitless to those in the Gentile world;[1] on which account, then, the seventh trumpet brings the complete destruction of the antichristian world. While, therefore, the Lord himself predicts the real fact of the destruction of Jerusalem, the same impending fact, of course, forms also for John the real goal of his prophecy; besides, he also agrees with the Lord in the fundamental prediction, in this, that he likewise maintains the inner connection between the individual acts of judgment upon Jerusalem, and the full final judgment; but in other respects the prediction of John is of an ideal character, so that we are neither to seek for the real fulfilment of individual expressions, nor, in order to conceal the incongruity between the words of prophecy and the facts of the destruction, to resort to the allegorical mode of exposition. In John, a judgment impends over the city, which is brought about no more by the heathen treading under foot (ver. 2) than by the earthquake (ver. 13), in the development of the mystery of God until its final completion, as a chief link in the chain of preliminary plagues, since it also forms a part of the second woe. ' But from this standpoint, the holy city cannot appear in the same light as the Gentile city, from the ground of antichristian secular power; but just as the sealed of God, as such, could not be touched by certain plagues,[2] the temple proper, as God's place of revelation, is preserved from the feet of the Gentiles, while the city wherein the witnesses of Christ like their Lord are slain is condemned to judgment. But this is distinguished also from the complete judgment upon Babylon, by the fact that the plague (the earthquake) is wrought as a salutary purification, since only the antichristian part are obliterated, while the rest of Israel are converted, and remain in safety.[3] We must therefore decide, not that in vv. 1–13 John *allegorizes* by representing the future destinies of the Christian Church under Jewish symbols, but that he *idealizes*,[4] by endeavoring to announce beforehand the impending destruction of Jerusalem, not according to the actual circumstances, but according to their inner connection with the ultimate fulfilment of the mystery of God,[5] and correspondingly to state the hope which the O. T. people of God still retained, in contrast with the heathen secular power, i.e., with "Babylon." In this ideal representation of prophecy, there belongs also the similar feature (ver. 4 sqq.). John does not think that Moses and Elijah will actually return,[6] accordingly he does

[1] Cf. ix. 20, xvi. 9.

[2] Cf. ix. 4.

[3] Cf. Isa. xxxvii. 31 sq.; Rom. ix. 27 sqq., xi. 7.

[4] Klief., who decidedly controverts this, nevertheless, by referring the closing words from ver. 8 to Jerusalem, and also rejecting allegorizing, reaches the result that "the Christianity of the last times appears as Jerusalem."

[5] Cf. x. 7.

[6] Against Hilgenf., etc.

not mention them; but with colors derived from the words of Zechariah, as also from the history of Moses and Elijah, he paints the ideal picture of the two prophetic preachers of repentance, who are to work in the manner, the spirit, and the power of Moses and Elijah. Hence we are not to inquire for a particular "meaning," or a particular "fulfilment" of what is here said.[1]

Vv. 15–19. At the blast of the *seventh* trumpet, which[2] will bring the glorious end, songs of praise resound in heaven which proclaim the fulfilment as having already occurred (vv. 15-18). At the opening of the heavenly temple of God, the ark of the covenant therein is visible, and lightnings, and other signs, indicating the judgments belonging to the actual fulfilment of the mystery of God, occur.

Ver. 15. *ἐγένοντο φωναὶ μεγ., κ.τ.λ.* To whom these voices belonged, is neither to be asked nor to be answered. Ewald wants to ascribe them to the four beasts;[3] De Wette, to the angels; Beng., to various dwellers in heaven, angels and men. Hengstenb. tries to show that the innumerable hosts, vii. 9 sq., are to be understood. This is incorrect, because the hosts which John there sees proleptically in heaven do not as yet correspond in xi. 15, with the progressive course of the visions, but are not actually in heaven until xv. 2 sqq.[4] Also in vv. 15-19 Hengstenb. mistakes the proleptical reference correctly understood by C. a Lap., Beng., Ew., De Wette, etc., by regarding all the contents of the seventh trumpet (the third woe) exhausted already with ver. 19. Still more preposterously, Ebrard limits the seventh trumpet to vv. 15–18.[5] — *ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ*, where John is not as yet,[6] but whither the look of the seer is directed.[7] — *λέγοντες*. Cf. iv. 8, v. 13. *ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ κόσμου*. The regal dominion over the world.[8] Instead of the obj. gen., in xvii. 18, *ἐπί* follows. Cf. also i. 6, xii. 10. The immediately following *καὶ βασιλεύσει* presupposes not only the active idea of *ἡ βασιλεία*, but also this reading. Incorrectly, Luther, according to the var. supported by Ew. ii., *ἐγένοντο αἱ βασιλεῖαι*: the kingdoms of this world. — The proleptical[9] in the songs of the heavenly voices lies in this, that immediately after the sound of the trumpet, and yet before any thing else has actually occurred of what is afterwards celebrated with similar songs of praise,[10] they say, *ἐγένετο ἡ βασ., κ.τ.λ.*[11] In reality the dominion over the world does not become God's and that of his Anointed until the wrathful judgment described, viz., until ch. xviii., yea, in another respect until xx. 10, has actually dislodged from its assumed dominion all ungodly and antichristian power, which, by its rebellion[12] against the only King and Lord, had usurped, to an extent, a part of his *βασιλεία*. The inner justification of the prolepsis — which Hengstenb. acknowledges only at vv. 15–18 in the relation to ver. 19, where he finds the final judgment — lies in the fact that the seventh trumpet has already actually sounded; that one, therefore, from which the real fulfilment of the

[1] See Intr., p. 42.
[2] Cf. x. 7.
[3] Iv. 8.
[4] Cf. xix. 1 sqq.
[5] See on ver. 19.
[6] Cf. x. 1.
[7] De Wette.
[8] Beng., De Wette, Hengstenb., etc.
[9] Also Klief.
[10] Cf. xix. 1 sqq.
[11] Cf. ver. 17 sq.: *εἰληφας — ἐβασίλευσας — ἦλθεν.*
[12] Beng.

mystery of God will infallibly proceed.[1] But even if only a special series of further visions leads to that final consummation, yet the prospective celebration of that glorious result, especially in the mouth of the dwellers in heaven, has, after the sounding of the seventh trumpet, its full justification and beautiful significance; the allusion, however, in connection with this, to redemption, as the proper root of the fact here celebrated,[2] is entirely out of place. — *τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ τοῦ χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ.* Not only the expression,[3] but also the idea, points back to Ps. ii. 2, for the Lord's Anointed is the Son of God because of the *βασιλεία*, which is taken in general, indeed, from the nations,[4] yet only for their destruction. — The *ἡμῶν* with *τ. κυρίου* does not give here a statement strange in itself concerning the co-regency of the saints,[5] but corresponds, as also xii. 10, xix. 1, v. 6, to the joy of those who now behold *their* Lord and God, whom they themselves serve, in his victorious dominion over the judged world. — *κ. βασιλεύσει εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τ. αἰών.* For, after his overthrow of all powers opposed to God, no new enemy could arise. The subj. to *βασιλεύσει* is *ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν*;[6] but his Christ is manifestly understood as partner of this *βασιλεία*.[7]

Vv. 16–18. Similar ascriptions of praise on the part of the twenty-four elders. *ἔπεσαν ἐπὶ τὰ πρόσωπα αὐτων*, like all angels. For the deepest humiliation of adoring creatures is becoming when the highest revelation of the glory of God, as here the subduing of all enemies, stands before the eyes.[8] — *εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι.* They *give thanks*, not because they consider themselves partakers of the great power and government of God,[9] which is as remote as in ver. 15, but because (*ὅτι εἴληφας, κ.τ.λ.*) the assumption of dominion on God's part has brought to the oppressors of the Church, whose representatives the elders are, retributory vengeance, but to the servants of God the complete reward.[10] The ascription of adoration, *κύριε ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ, κ.τ.λ.*, in which the guaranty for the glorious result of God's ways was previously indicated,[11] appears now when that glorious end is beheld as already attained to be actually realized.[12] But from the former significant designation of God, *ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος*,[13] this last point necessarily is omitted; for the ascription of praise, even though proleptical, applies even to that which has now come, and thus the fulfilment of his mystery has been attained.[14] Luther improperly follows the bad revision of the text, in which the *καὶ ὁ ἐρχ.* is interpolated from i. 8, iv. 8. — *ὅτι εἰληφας τ. δύναμίν σου τ. μεγ. καὶ ἐβασίλευσας.* The assumption of great power[15] is the means for entrance upon the kingdom;[16] but as the exclamation *κύριε ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ* properly conditions the mode of representation in the *ἐβασίλευσας*, the *σου* with the *τ. δύναμ.* marks

[1] Beng., De Wette, etc.
[2] Hengstenb.
[3] Cf. xii. 10; Acts iv. 26.
[4] Cf. ver. 18.
[5] Hengstenb.
[6] According to ver. 17: *κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκρ.*
[7] Beng., De Wette.
[8] Cf. iv. 10, v. 8, 14, xix. 4. Beng.
[9] Hengstenb.
[10] Ver. 18. Cf. also vi. 9 sqq., vii. 14 sqq., xix. 1 sqq.
[11] i. 8, iv. 8. Cf. also x. 6.
[12] Cf. xv. 3, xvi. 7, 14, xix. 6, 15, xxi. 22.
[13] i. 8, iv. 8.
[14] Cf. xvi. 5. Beng., Hengstenb.
[15] Cf. Zech. vi. 13; Ps. xciii. 1.
[16] Cf., on this application of the idea of *βασιλεύειν*, Ps. xciii. 1; 2 Sam. xv. 10, xvi. 8, etc.

also the presupposition that it was only, apparently, that the unconditioned power which he has now seized was not possessed by the eternal Ruler of all, while he allowed the antichristian powers to be exercised against himself and his Christ. — Ver. 18. According to the fundamental thought of ver. 2,[1] although the expression comes from Ps. xcix. 1,[2] there is a description of how the wrath of God has risen against the wrath of his enemies, to the destruction of the destroyers, in the final judgment which brings its reward to the servants of God. — The more minute description in the words *τὰ ἔθνη ὠργίσθησαν, κ.τ.λ.*, of the *εἴληφας τ. δύν., κ.τ.λ.*, ver. 17,[3] which occurs in the final judgment described here in all its parts, is subjoined by the simple *καὶ*. But the entire ascription of adoration proves itself to be so clearly a prolepsis of that which is not represented in details until in the visions following that extend up to xxii. 5, and comprise the actual end, that even the expressions mostly agree with those of the succeeding chapter. The explanation of the tenor of the subject is to be derived from what follows. How the enraged Gentiles, impelled by the anger of the devil,[4] come forth against the Lord and his servants, is, of course, to be seen already from xi. 9 sqq.;[5] but the complete representation of the Gentile antichrist is given first in what follows,[6] and it properly pertains to this, that *ἦλθεν ἡ ὀργή σου* is described as actually entering, first in chs. xvi.–xviii., and then xix. 1 sqq., is celebrated as actually occurring, just as in this passage proleptically. The expression *τοὺς διαφθείροντας τ. γῆν* is to be understood first from the entire description of Babylon, the antichristian secular power.[7] The *καιρὸς τῶν νεκρῶν κριθῆναι*, which is celebrated in this passage proleptically as having already occurred (*ἦλθεν*), occurs actually not until in xx. 11 sqq.; so also the time for giving the servants of God their reward occurs actually not until the Divine completion of the mystery of God (xxi. 1–xxii. 5). — *τοῖς δούλοις σου — μεγάλοις*. This circumstantial formula is intended to designate the *entire number* of all those who receive God's reward in contrast with those condemned to judgment.[8] The classification is not to be pressed, — against Beng. and Hengstenb., who refer the *τ. δουλ. σ.* to *τ. προφ.* and *κ. τ. ἁγίοις*, and oppose to these servants of God, in an eminent sense, the entire mass of those who fear the name of the Lord (*κ. τ. φοβ., κ.τ.λ.*), in connection with which Hengstenb. wants a special emphasis recognized as resting not only upon *τ. ἁγίοις*, but immediately afterwards also upon *τοῖς μικροῖς*, as he understands small and great not in the simplest sense.[9] But *τ. δούλ. σου* belongs[10] only to *τ. προφήταις*, whereby all those are designated who have served God by proclaiming the Divine mysteries. Beside them stand the *ἅγιοι*, as believers in general are called.[11] The final designation *κ. τ. φοβουμ. τ. ὀν. σου τοῖς μικροῖς καὶ τ. μεγ.*, comprehends finally and summarily the entire mass of the

[1] Cf. already ver. 15.

[2] LXX.: *ὁ κύριος ἐβασίλευσεν, ὀργιζέσθωσαν λαοί*. Beng., De Wette, Hengstenb.

[3] Cf. De Wette.

[4] xii. 17. Cf. xi. 7.

[5] Cf. vi. 10.

[6] Cf. xiii. 10 sqq., xvi. 6, xvii. 6, xviii. 24.

[7] Cf. xix. 2, where the *ἔκρινε* corresponds, with reference to the actually fulfilled judgment, to the *διαφθεῖραι* in this passage.

[8] Cf. xxi. 1 sqq., iii. 5, 12, 21.

[9] xiii. 16, xix. 18, xx. 12; Acts viii. 10, xxvi. 22. Cf. Ps. cxv. 13, where, of course, Hengstenb. interprets "the great" as priests.

[10] Cf. x. 7.

[11] xiii. 7, 10, xiv. 12, xvii. 6, xx. 9, xviii. 20.

godly, no matter whether prophets or saints absolutely,[1] whether small or great.

Ver. 19. Corresponding, on God's part, to the songs of adoration with which the inhabitants of heaven, immediately after the sounding of the seventh trumpet, celebrate the fulfilment of the mystery of God (proleptically), is the opening of the heavenly *temple*,[2] whereby the ark of the covenant in the holiest of all, up to this time hidden, becomes visible no less to John and to the entire host of heaven.[3] What this, together with the accompanying lightning, etc., signifies, must be misunderstood if we either[4] find the entire contents of what belongs in the seventh trumpet actually exhausted with ver. 19, and consequently regard ver. 19 itself as the description of the final judgment, — so that then with ch. xii. we begin anew "by recapitulating," — or entirely separate ver. 19 from vv. 15–18, and with ver. 18 stand already at the actual end,[5] so that with ver. 19 the recapitulation begins. According to the former view, in ver. 19 blessedness is prepared for the godly, as well as condemnation announced against the godless. But if in ver. 19 the actual fulfilment of the mystery of God is to be rendered conspicuous, this conclusion would be highly unsatisfactory; yet it is never said what is the effect of the lightning, etc. In the correct feeling of "mysterious brevity,"[6] which the entire section (vv. 15–19) has, if the same is to bring the conclusion actually announced in x. 7, Vitr., Hengstenb., etc., refer to ch. xvi. sqq., as the further development of what is here briefly said. In this there lies an uncertain acknowledgment of that which De Wette, etc., have said with distinctness concerning the proleptical nature of the entire section, vv. 15–19; for in the same way as the ascriptions of adoration, upon the basis of the fact that the seventh trumpet has sounded, anticipate the fulfilment still to be actually expected, the signs also described in both parts of ver. 19 are not the real execution of the final judgment, but the immediate preparations and adumbrations thereof. The temple of God in heaven is the place where God's final judgments of wrath upon the world issue;[7] the ark of the *covenant*, present therein, is the heavenly symbol and pledge of the immutable grace of God, because of which the blessed mystery[8] promised through the prophets to believers whom he has received into his covenant, shall undoubtedly be fulfilled. If, therefore, after the blast of the seventh trumpet, the temple of God is opened so that the ark of the covenant becomes visible, the door is opened, as it were, for the final judgment proceeding from[9] the most secret sanctuary of God concerning the

[1] Cf. xxii. 9.

[2] Cf. iii. 12, vii. 15, xiv. 15, etc.

[3] In order to explain the conception of this entire view, we need not recall the Jewish statement: "Quodcunque in terra est, id etiam in coelo est" (Sohar, *Genes.*, p. 91 in Schöttgen; *De Hieros. Coelesti*, sec. 2; *Hor. Hebr.*, p. 1206). John speaks of a heavenly temple, altar, ark of the covenant, with the same right as of a heavenly throne, seats of the elders, etc. But the introduction of the Jewish fable, that in the last Messianic times, the real lost ark of the covenant, which, meanwhile, has been concealed in heaven, will again be brought to sight (against Ewald), — of this there is no trace in the text.

[4] Hengstenb. Cf. already Beda, Aret., Calov., etc.

[5] Ebrard.

[6] Hengstenb.

[7] Cf. xiv. 15, 17, xv. 5 sqq., xvi. 1, 17.

[8] x. 7.

[9] Cf. xix. 2.

godless world, and the sight of the ark indicates that the fulfilment of the hope of sharers in the covenant, pledged by it, is now to be realized. For on this account, also, there are threatening foretokens[1] of that which at the execution of the judgment actually comes upon the antichristian world.[2] So also Klief.

The older allegorists, from whose mode of exposition Hengstenb. and Ebrard deviate in ver. 15 sqq., advance here also the most wonderful propositions. N. de Lyra refers the whole to the victory of the Goths, and other Arians under Narses. The seventh trumpet-angel is the Emperor Justin II. — In Calov. and other older Protestants, who, however, recognize the proleptical character of vv. 15–19 less distinctly, the reference to the Papacy coheres with their view of the succeeding chapters. The ark of the covenant (ver. 19) is applied by many to Christ, while C. a Lap. and the Cath. want to refer it especially to the Virgin Mary, yet without denying the reference to the humanity of Christ. — Eichh., Heinr., etc., find here the literal destruction of Jerusalem, and, accordingly, the complete victory of Christianity over Judaism — in connection with which τ. ἐθνη ὠργίσθ., ver. 18, is explained: "Judaism offered difficulties to Christian discipline,"[3] and the βασιλεύσει, κ.τ.λ., ver. 15, is interpreted: "It shall come to pass that the Christian religion shall be oppressed by no other;" the βρονταὶ, κ.τ.λ., ver. 19, indicate the ruin of the city. Grot. maintained his reference to the times of Barcocheba[4] by such interpretations as that of βασιλεύσει, κ.τ.λ., ver. 15: "The Christian religion will always be in Judaea;" or on ver. 18: "By this, Christians who were in Judaea were commanded always to elevate their minds to the highest heaven where God dwells, where the ark of the covenant, i.e., the good things of the new covenant, are kept in store."

Notes by the American Editor.

LXVII. Ver. 1. τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, κ.τ.λ.

Alford argues at length in criticism of Düsterdieck's interpretation, by which the measuring is referred to the literal and earthly Jerusalem: "I would strongly recommend any one who takes that view, to read through the very unsatisfactory and shuffling comment of Düsterdieck here; the result of which is, that, finding, as he of course does, many discrepancies between this and our Lord's prophecy of the same destruction of Jerusalem, he is driven to the refuge that while our Lord describes matters of fact, St. John *idealizes* the catastrophe, setting it forth, not as it really took place, but according to its inner connection with the final accomplishment of the mystery of God, and correspondently with the hope which God's O. T. people possessed, as contrasted with the heathen power of this world which abides in 'Babylon.' But if 'Babylon' is the abode of the world, why not 'Jerusalem' of the Church? If our interpreter, maintaining the literal sense, is allowed so far to 'idealize' as to exempt the

[1] Cf. viii. 5.

[2] Cf. xvi. 18 sqq., where hail also is again mentioned.

[3] According to Calov.'s interpretation of τὰ ἔθνη as referring to Catholics.

[4] Cf. xi. 13.

temple of God itself (ver. 1) from a destruction which we know overtook it, and nine-tenths of the city (ver. 13) from an overthrow which destroyed it all, surely there is an end to the meaning of words. If Jerusalem here is simply Jerusalem, and the prophecy regards her overthrow by the Romans, and especially if this passage is to be made such use of as to set aside the testimony of Irenæus as to the date of the Apoc. by the stronger testimony of the Apoc. itself [so Düsterdieck from Lücke], then must every particular be shown to tally with known history; or, if this cannot be done, at least it must be shown that none contradicts it. If this cannot be done, then we may fairly infer that the prophecy has no such reference, or only remotely, here and there, and not as to its principal subject. Into whatever difficulty we may be led by the remark, it is no less true that the *πόλις ἡ ἁγία* of ver. 2 cannot be the same as the *πόλις ἡ μεγάλη* of ver. 8. This has been felt by the literal interpreters, and they have devised ingenious reasons why the holy city should afterwards be called the great city. . . . Düsterd.: 'Because it is impossible in one breath to call a city 'holy,' and 'Sodom and Egypt.' Most true; then must we not look for some other city than one which this very prophecy has called most holy?" He understands the *ναὸς τ. θεοῦ* and its *θυσιαστήριον* as referring to "the Church of the elect servants of God, everywhere in this book symbolized by Jews in deed and truth. The society of these, as a whole, is the *νάος* agreeably to Scripture symbolism elsewhere, e.g., 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17, and is symbolized by the inner or holy place of the Jerusalem temple, in and among which they, as true Israelites and priests unto God, have a right to worship and minister. These are they who, properly speaking, alone are *measured;* estimated and again in this book by tale and number, — partakers in the first resurrection, the Church of the first-born." Gebhardt, however, while emphatically rejecting Düsterdieck's literalism, restricts the measuring to Jewish Christians (p. 258): "Can we still understand 'the holy city,' 'the great city,' to be Jerusalem in a purely local sense? No; the city is Jerusalem, but, as frequently elsewhere, it is at the same time the representative of the Jewish people. The seer was to 'measure the temple of God, and the altar, and them that worship therein;' i.e., as Christians generally were protected from the trumpet and vial plagues (vii. 1–4), so should Christians out of Israel be protected from the judgments which were to come upon Jerusalem and the Jewish people (compare Matt. xxiv. 15–18). On the contrary, the court without the temple was to be 'left out,' for it was given to the Gentiles, and they should tread the holy city under foot forty and two months; i.e., the judgments already predicted by Daniel will burst in upon the non-christian, unbelieving Jewish people. Whether John, by its being given to the Gentiles, and their treading it under foot, had in mind the destruction of Jerusalem, the words do not expressly say."

CHAPTER XII.

Ver. 2. *κράζει.* So A, Elz., Beng., Griesb., Tisch. ℵ: *καὶ κράζει* [W. and H.]. The well-attested reading *καὶ ἔκραζεν* (C, 2, 3, al., Primas, Andr., Vulg., Syr., Matth. — but without *καί*, — Lach.) is apparently, like the ill-attested *ἔκραζεν*, a modification. Also in ver. 4, Primas, Vulg., substitute the imperf. for *σίρει.* — Ver. 5. Instead of the most generally supported *ἄρρενα* (ℵ, Elz., Beng., Griesb., Matth., Tisch. 1854), Lach., whom Tisch. 1859 and IX. follows, has written, in accord with A, C, *ἄρσεν.* The incorrectness (De Wette) of this so strongly attested reading is not greater than, e.g., xi. 4; besides, the preceding and succeeding *τὸ τέκνον* may, to an extent, explain the incorrect combination *νίὸν ἄρσεν*, in which the one conception appears to be in a certain apposition with the other. — Ver. 6. The Hebraizing (cf. iii. 8, vii. 2) *ἐκεῖ* after *ὅπου ἔχει* (A, ℵ, 2, 4, 6, al., Compl., Plant., Genev., Beng., Griesb., Matth., Tisch. [W. and H.]) is altogether absent in C (Elz., Lach.); but even if one wished to admit of no intentional avoidance of the Hebraism, the accidental omission alongside of *ἔχει* appears easy. — Ver. 7. *τοῦ πολεμῆσαι μετὰ.* So Beng. already, according to decided witnesses. The modification *ἐπολέμησαν κατὰ* (Elz.) has no critical authority whatever. In ℵ the *τοῦ* is lacking, but only by an oversight. Indorsed by Tisch. IX. — Ver. 10. *ἐβλήθη.* So A, C, ℵ, 2, 4, al., Beng., Matth., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]. Incorrectly, Elz.: *κατεβλ.* — *καιηγορῶν αὐτοὺς.* A, 28, Erasm., 1, 2, 3, al., Beng., Lach. Tisch. The well-attested *αὐτῶν* (C, ℵ, Elz., Griesb., Matth.) is suspicious because of its regularity; cf. Winer, p. 191. — Ver. 12. *τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν.* Unattested is the manifest gloss: *τοῖς κατοικοῦσι τὴν γ. καὶ τὴν θάλ.* (Elz.). But even the reading, indorsed by Beng., Griesb., Matth., Lach. (small ed.), Tisch., 1854, *τῇ γῇ κ. τῇ θαλάσσῃ* (B, 2, 4, 6, al., Vulg., Syr., Copt., Aeth., edd. Compl., Plant., Genev.) appears to be a modification (cf. viii. 13), while the accus., proposed by A (especially *τὴν ἀγάπην κ. τὴν θαλ.*) and C, commends itself just by its difficulty, and has been received besides into the Elz. recension. Treg., Lach. (large ed.), and Tisch. 1859 and IX. [W. and H.], have the accus., which is by no means inexplicable (against De Wette). ℵ interprets: *εἰς τ. γ.* — Ver. 17. The *ἐπὶ* before *τῇ γυν.* (A, ℵ, Elz., Tisch.) is lacking in C (Lach.), and is at least suspicious. — Ver. 18. *ἐστάθη.* See on ch. xiii.

The fulfilment of the mystery of God impending, x. 7, in the days of the seventh trumpet is celebrated by the inhabitants of the earth as having already occurred [1] after the seventh angel, xi. 15, has sounded his trumpet, but is not actually shown as yet to the seer; nevertheless, he has already (xi. 19) beheld such signs as cause the expectation of that end. That this, together with his eternal glory and blessedness, cannot come without preceding divine judgments, is self-evident,[2] and is indicated also at the close of

[1] In a proleptical way.

[2] Cf. vi. 10.

xi. 19, by threatening signs. xi. 17 also refers to the infernal nature that is operative in human hatred to Christ and his believers, and with respect to which, no less than to human antichristianism, the Lord comes to judgment; but if that judgment for which the Lord comes is to be otherwise stated with correct fulness and proof, not only must the most profound satanic basis of all antichristianism incurring the judgment be first discovered, but also the most essential forms in which this enters the world from the ultimate foundation of satanic antichristianism must also be stated. The former occurs in ch. xii.: Satan, who had in vain persecuted Christ himself, turns with his antichristian fury against Christ's believers.[1]

Ver. 1 sq. *σημεῖον*. An appearance whereby something is described, and thus revealed to the seer, *σημαίνεται*.[2] In the most general sense, any appearance beheld by John might be called a *σημεῖον* (אוֹת); but although such visions as vi. 3 sqq., viii. 7–ix. 21, are, therefore, in no way of an allegorical nature, because in themselves they describe things just as the prophet regards them as real (real shedding of blood, vi. 3; real famine, vi. 5 sqq.; real quaking of the earth, and falling of heavenly bodies, and other real plagues), the *σημεῖον* in this passage (cf. ver. 3, xv. 1) has in it something allegorical, — since the context in itself manifests this, and marks it by the particular expression *σημεῖον*, — inasmuch as, by the form of the woman that is beheld, it is not the person of an actual woman which is to be represented. — *μέγα*, "great," i.e., of large appearance, and, accordingly, of important significance.[3] — *ὤφθη*. Cf. xi. 19. — *ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ*. Heaven is the locality where[4] signs bringing a revelation manifest themselves to the seer.[5] So, correctly, De Wette and Hengstenb., only that the former[6] ascribes to John a repeated inconsistency in reference to the standpoint, — which is regarded as being, from xi. 15, again in heaven, but afterwards (xi. 18) is imperceptibly transferred to the earth, — while Hengstenb. repeats the error:[7] "To be in the Spirit, and to be in heaven, is the same," with which the explanation, "What the seer sees belongs not to sensuous, but supersensuous, spheres," by no means properly harmonizes. The latter remark is allied to the false interpretation of the *ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ*, attempted in a twofold way, according to which the *ἐν τ. οὐρ.* is understood with reference to the *γυνή*,[8] or the *δράκων*, ver. 3.[9] — *γυνή* — *τεκεῖν*. Whether and in what way the Church is to be understood by the woman, cannot be inferred until the close of the entire vision,[10] since the particular points of the text condition the meaning of the whole. The emblematic description (*περιβεβλημένη* — *δώδεκα*) represents the woman who is just about bearing, ver. 2, in a heavenly brilliancy reminding us of the manifestation

[1] Cf. ver. 17.

[2] Cf. i. 1.

[3] Cf. xv. 1, 3; Matt. xxiv. 24; Acts vi. 8, viii. 13; John i. 51, v. 20, xiv. 12.

[4] Cf. iv. 1.

[5] Cf. v. 1 sqq., vi. 1 sqq., viii. 1 sqq., ix. 1 sqq., x. 1, xi. 15 sqq.

[6] Cf. x. 1.

[7] Cf. iv. 1 sqq.

[8] Calov.: "What is signified by the things which John saw in heavenly majesty is fulfilled in the ecclesiastical heaven." Cf. Vitr., Beng., Auberlen, p. 282.

[9] Eichh.: "In the air, or, as commonly said, the extreme region of the air; for that same place is to be assigned by the poet to the woman, as was believed to be that of the demons, good and bad, whom he wanted to produce upon the scene." Cf. Grot.: "In the centre, between heaven and earth. In the matter signified, this means that heavenly and earthly causes mutually concur."

[10] See on ver. 17.

of Christ[1] and of God.[2]—*περιβεβλημένη τὸν ἥλιον. Clothed with the sun.* The idea resembles that of Ps. civ. 2,[3] only that in this passage the description is more concrete, since it is not light in general, but the more definite and perceptible sun, the heavenly body radiating all light, that appears as the dress of the woman, — not "as breastplate, and, accordingly, as an integrant part of the clothing."[4] The *περιβ. τ. ἥλιον* allows a definite allegorical interpretation as little as the two other features of the description, *καὶ ἡ σελήνη ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτῆς* and *καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτῆς στέφανος ἀστέρων δώδεκα*, only that the definite number *twelve* of the stars is conditioned[5] in a similar way by the number of the tribes of Israel;[6] as in i. 16, 20, the number seven of stars by the number of particular churches. The reference to the twelve apostles[7] is incorrect, because the woman appears at all events as mother of Christ, ver. 5, and accordingly cannot admit of emblems whose meaning presupposes not only the birth, but also the entire life and work, of the church. For the same reason, the allegorical interpretations of the *ἥλιος*, as referring to Christ himself as "the sun of righteousness,"[8] and the *σελήνη* as referring to "the teachers who borrow their light from Christ,"[9] or to "the light of the law and prophets far inferior to the light of Christ,"[10] are to be rejected. Hengstenb. regards the sun and moon as emblems of the uncreated and the created light, which has in itself as little foundation as it stands in harmony with the (correct) reference of the twelve stars to the tribes of Israel; this applies against Beng., who understands by the sun the Christian empire and government, and by the moon the Mohammedan power whose insignia is the crescent. The allegorical interpretation also of the moon, which is "under the feet of the woman," attempted with various modification,[11] show their arbitrariness already by the fact that, in one way or another, they disturb the symmetrical relation to the other features of the description, which, as a whole, has only the intention of displaying the holy and glorious nature of the woman from her heavenly form, whereby the individual features of the poetic description are as eminently beautiful as they are naturally striking. For the form of the woman itself appears clothed with the *sun*, and in the clearest radiancy; she stands also on a body of light, the *moon;* while a crown of *stars* — and that twelve — encircle her head also with a peculiar brilliancy. — The woman is with child (*ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα*), and, besides, as the further description immediately afterwards says more explicitly, just about to be delivered (cf. ver. 4 sq.): "She cried travailing in birth, and pained to be delivered" (*κράζει ὠδίνουσα, κ.τ.λ.*).[12]

[See Note LXVIII., p. 357.]

[1] i. 13–16. Cf. especially ver. 16: *ἡ ὄψις αὐτ. ὡς ὁ ἥλιος, κ.τ.λ.*

[2] iv. 3.

[3] *ἀναβαλλόμενος φῶς ὡς ἱμάτιον.*

[4] Ebrard.

[5] De Wette, Ebrard, Hengstenb., etc.

[6] Cf. vii. 4 sqq.

[7] Beda, C. a Lap., Stern, Aret., Vitr., etc.

[8] Andr., Beda, N. de Lyra, C. a Lap., Stern, Aret., Grot., Calov., etc.

[9] Calov.

[10] Grot.

[11] Beda: "The Church of Christ, girdled with light, treads under foot temporal glory." Vitr.: "Because, mutable things in religion being abolished, an immovable kingdom has followed." Cf. C. a Lap., Herd., etc. Ebrard: "The moon is the night vanquished by her; the stars are the lights enkindled by her in the night, which vanquish it."

[12] Concerning the loose connection of the inf. *τεκεῖν* with *βασανιζομένη*, cf. Winer, p. 306 sqq.

Vv. 3, 4. By another sign now becoming visible, the mortal enemy of the woman and her child, i.e., the devil, is described to the seer. The idea of the devil (cf. ver. 9) as a *δράκων* [1] is based upon Gen. iii.,[2] to which the connection of *ὁ δράκων ὁ μέγας* with *ὁ ὄφις ὁ ἀρχ.*, ver. 9, and the interchange of the expressions *ὁ δράκων* and *ὁ ὄφις*, vv. 13, 15, clearly refers. The *great size* of the dragon may be inferred from his dreadful power;[3] he appears to be *fiery red*, either "because fire[4] is the symbol of destruction and corruption,"[5] or "because he is the *ἀνθρωποκτόνος ἀπ' ἀρχῆς*,"[6] and also "is intent upon the murder of the child of the woman, as well as the murder of all believers;"[7] in favor of the last is especially the circumstance that the representation of the devil is given with concrete distinctness, viz., with respect to the Romish secular power which is drunken with the blood of the martyrs.[8] The objection that *πυρρός* is not blood-red[9] is not pertinent.[10] — *ἔχων κεφαλὰς — ἑπτὰ διαδήματα.* The two questions as to in what manner the *ten horns* on the *seven* diademed *heads* should be regarded as distributed, and what is the proper meaning and reference of these heads, horns, and diadems, inseparably cohere, but are not to be answered from the context of ch. xii. alone, but only from ch. xiii. compared with ch. xvii. Upon a mere conjecture depend the views of Vitr., that the middle head (i.e., Diocletian) bore all the ten horns (i.e., governed ten provinces); and of De Wette, that three heads had double horns. The opinion also of Bengel, received by Hengstenb., Ebrard, etc., that one of the heads, viz., the seventh, bore all ten horns, cannot be derived from xvii. 12. — With respect to the meaning of the heads, etc., only a few among the older allegorists have misjudged that since the seven heads, ten horns, and ten diadems are common to the dragon and the beast furnished with power from the same, ch. xiii., the interpretation there given by John himself must regulate the explanation also of ch. xii. The devil manifestly appears as the proper author, working in the deepest foundation of every antichristian being, in such form as corresponds to the form of the beast, i.e., of the antichristian power actually entering this earthly world, and serving the dragon as an instrument. Without any support, therefore, are all such expositions as that of Tirinus, who understands the seven heads of the dragon as the seven deadly sins.[11] But De Wette's proposition also to explain the heads as an emblem of sagacity, and the horns of power, and the numbers seven and ten as the well-known mystical numbers without precise significance, in no way satisfies the analogy of ch. xiii.; the numbers also maintain their definite application in ch. xiii. (and ch xi), and, therefore, cannot be taken in similar indefiniteness as that of the *τὸ τρίτον τ. ἀστ.* directly afterwards in ver. 4. It is[12] the antichristian secular power of the Roman Empire which is beheld in

[1] Cf Kidduschim, p. 29, 2 b.; Wetst.: "A demon appeared to him in the form of a dragon having seven heads."

[2] Cf. 2 Cor. xi. 3.

[3] Cf. ver. 4: *κ. ἡ οὐρὰ, κ.τ.λ.*

[4] Cf. ix. 17 sqq.

[5] Ebrard.

[6] John viii. 44.

[7] Vict., N. de Lyra, C. a Lap., Aret., De Wette, Hengstenb., etc.

[8] Cf. xvii. 4, 6.

[9] Ebrard.

[10] Cf. on vi. 4.

[11] "The pride of the lion, the greed of the tiger, the luxury of the bear, the gluttony of the wolf, the enmity of the serpent, the wrath of the viper, the indolence of the ass."

[12] Cf. already Vict.

ch. xiii. under the form of the seven-headed and ten-horned beast;[1] and, besides, the precise number of heads, horns, and diadems was based upon the historical relations of that empire;[2] according to this is to be understood the analogous and, as it were, archetypal appearance of the dragon working by means of that secular power.[3] Erroneous, therefore, are all the explanations which, instead of the concrete reference to the Roman Empire, either introduce extraneous specialties,[4] or keep to indefinite generality.[5] The latter applies especially also against Hofm.,[6] Hengstenb., and Ebrard, who by a false explanation of properly adduced passages, xvii. 9 and ch. xiii., and by an incorrect comparison of the ten horns of the dragon with the ten (still future) kings, xvii. 12, understand the seven dragon-heads of the seven phases of the godless secular power; but the ten horns, which (improperly) are regarded as on the seven heads, of the tenfold division of that ultimate secular power. Among the older allegorists, Calov. has correctly received the reference as made to Rome, but perverted it by not explaining the seven crowned dragon-heads from the relations of the imperial succession,[7] but by regarding them as designations of the seven forms of government received in the entire history of Rome.[8] The corresponding original form of the dragon must also be understood according to the standard, derived from chs. xiii. and xvii., of the beast in the service of the dragon, through which the Roman secular government with its emperors is symbolized. The ten horns correspond to ten personal rulers, who as emperors stand within the horizon of the prophet as possessors of the Roman Empire: (1) Augustus, (2) Tiberius, (3) Caligula, (4) Claudius, (5) Nero, (6) Galba, (7) Otho, (8) Vitellius, (9) Vespasian, (10) Titus. Thus also in xiii. 1 the ten horns of the beast, each of which bears a diadem, are meant; but in other respects the same fundamental view in chs. xiii. and xvii. is not applied and carried out with entire uniformity. The idea that one of the seven heads is mortally wounded, but again healed, applies indeed to the beast of ch. xiii., but not to the dragon; and both descriptions, chs. xii. and xiii., are distinguished from the statement of ch. xvii. especially by the fact that in the former a genuine emperor, the last possessor of the Roman Empire, and ten kings still to come, who are distinguished throughout from those indicated by the ten horns of chs. xii. and xiii., come within the sphere of the prophecy; while, on the other hand, ch. xvii. makes no further reference to that which is designated in ch. xiii. by the mortal wound of the one head, than by the inequality, common to all three chapters, between the number *ten* of the

[1] Cf. Dan. vii. 7.

[2] Cf. xiii. 1, xvii. 9 sqq.

[3] Cf. Grot., Wetst., Ew.

[4] N. de Lyra: "Khosroo, the Persian king, hostile to Christianity, is the seventh head; the six others are vassal kings; the ten horns, divisions of the army." Cf. also Coccej., Beng., etc.

[5] Beda: "The devil armed with the power of the earthly kingdom. The seven heads = all his kings; the ten horns = the whole kingdom."

[6] "The Lamb had seven horns and seven eyes; the dragon has seven heads as a sign that his power is not indivisible; but the number of the powers into which his kingdom is dispersed is that of divine possibility. But his horns, i.e., the instruments of his strength, are ten, according to the number of human possibility." Weiss: *U. Evf.*, ii. p. 349.

[7] Cf. xvii. 10, xiii. 3.

[8] 1. Kings. 2. Consuls. 3. Decemviri. 4. Military tribunes. 5. Dictators. 6. Cæsars. 7. Odoacer, or even the Roman pontiffs.

horns and *seven* of the *heads*. The seven heads are expressly designated as seven kings, i.e., emperors; John also says that the sixth is present.[1] This peculiar relation between the number "ten" of the emperors and "seven" of the emperors, can only have the meaning which is indicated in another way also by the healed mortal wound, viz., that only with seven wearers of the diadem is the actual and true possession of the government found, — according to which a horn is to be regarded as on each of the seven heads of the dragon (and of the beast, xiii. 1),[2] — while three among the ten wearers of the diadem, viz., the three chiefs, Galba, Otho, and Vitellius, by their rebellion possessed only an "uncertain and, as it were, unsettled imperial power."[3] The three horns, which recall these three usurpers, are on one of the seven heads neither in the dragon nor the beast. Where they are to be regarded, is not to be inferred in the same way from the idea of the forms of the dragon and the beast as the position of the seven (crowned, xiii. 1) horns on the seven (crowned, xii. 3) heads; if John himself had had a precise view of the position of those three horns, he might have regarded them — corresponding to the historical condition — as between the fifth and the sixth crowned heads. — *καὶ ἡ οὐρὰ, κ.τ.λ.* By a highly dramatic stroke John portrays the track of the dragon, as by moving his dreadful tail hither and thither, he tore away a large (the third, viii. 7 sq.) part of the stars of heaven, and cast them down to earth. An undoubted adumbration of this description is Dan. viii. 10, where a horn that grew up to heaven cast down the stars. But in John the dragon appears *ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ*, like the woman, ver. 1; the more readily suggested, therefore, is the conception, that while in an eager rage he lashes about his tail, it casts down from heaven the stars which it strikes.[4] An attempt at false allegorizing lies in this feature of the description, in the fact that the seven heads, etc., have certainly a precise figurative reference; but the circumstance already that the numerical statement *τὸ τρίτον*, ver. 4, is to be taken only schematically, while the numbers ver. 3 are to be taken with literal accuracy, gives the description another character. The allegorical explanations offered[5] could be only arbitrary and fluctuating, because they depend entirely upon the error that they seek for a definitely ascribed prophetic thought, where the text gives only the expressive feature of a poetical description; a feature, however, which is important and characteristic in the entire presentation of the dragon, because thereby, in a way corresponding to the nature of dragons[6] and the visionary

[1] xvii. 10.

[2] The diadems are found, with the dragon, on the heads; with the beast, on the horns; corresponding in the one place to the number seven of actual emperors, and in the other to the number ten of all possessors of the government.

[3] Cf. Sueton., *Vesp.*, i.

[4] Cf. Eichh., Ew.

[5] Cf., e.g., Beda: "It indicates the strength and malice of the enemy, who by deceitful arts, as though with his tail, cast down an innumerable part of angels or men." Aret.: "The tail is the end of time — the Papacy, for to this the Roman Empire at length degenerated." Vitr.: "The devil, through the emperors of Rome, persecutors of the faith, caused the teachers of the gospel to be disturbed." In like manner, Grot., who refers the *οὐρά* to Simon Magus, who led astray the third part, not only of Christian people, but also of the people. Calov., Beng., Stern, etc.: "The victory of earthly rulers." Ebrard, etc.: "The seduction of the angels." The best still, De Wette: "Violence perpetrated in the kingdom of light."

[6] "Dragons have their power, not in their teeth, but in their tails" (Solin, 30, in Wetst.).

locality (ἐν τ. οὐρανῷ), the rage and eagerness of the devil appearing as a dragon are made visible. — The dragon has in view, above all things, the child who is about to be born of the woman; he puts himself[1] before the travailing woman, in order that, when she have given birth, he may devour the child.

Vv. 5, 6. The child is born, but rescued; the woman also flees. — υἱὸν ἄρσεν. The expression, without regard to its peculiar incorrectness,[2] reminds us of the זָכָר בֵּן, Jer. xx. 15,[3] but is still more emphatic in the prominence given the male sex of the child, since the grammatical reason, rendering possible the harsh agreement of the masc. υἱόν and the neut. ἄρσεν, lies in the fact that the ἄρσεν appears as a sort of apposition: "a son, a male." The intention of this emphasis, which De Wette improperly denies, is not that of designating the child as victor over the dragon,[4] but[5] points to what is added concerning the child immediately afterwards; ὃς μέλλει ποιμ., κ.τ.λ. These words taken from Ps. ii. 9 (LXX.), which are referred also to Christ in xix. 15, make it indubitable that the child born of the woman is the Messiah;[6] but the designation of Christ by these words of the Messianic Psalm is in this passage[7] the most appropriate and significant, since the fact is made prominent that this child just born is the one who with irresistible power will visit in judgment the antichristian heathen. By the words of the Psalm, John, therefore, designates the Lord as the ἐρχόμενον, who, as is especially kept in view by ch. xii., will also come with his iron rod upon the Gentile-Roman antichrist. As, therefore, John by the words of the Psalm designates the child in a way completely corresponding to the fundamental idea of the entire Apoc., and points to the ultimate end in the Messianic judgment, he at the same time discloses the reason why Satan lays snares chiefly for the child, and then also for the woman and believers; and why especially the Gentile-Roman empire — whose insignia the dragon wears, and which is the means of his wrath — persecutes believers in Christ in the manner depicted further in what follows.[8] Thus the designation of the child shows the significance of the entire vision, ch. xii., in its relation to what follows. The result, however, is also that all the expositors who regard the child born of the woman as any thing else than the Messiah, and that, too, in his concrete personality, miss the surest standpoint for the exposition of the entire ch. xii., and with this the correct standpoint for the comprehension of ch. xiii. sqq. This applies especially in opposition to all those who, however much they diverge in details, yet agree in the fundamental error that they regard the child as Christ, only in a certain metonymical sense, by understanding it properly, speaking of Christ living in believers, and thus of believers themselves. Thus Beda: "The Church is always, though the

[1] Concerning the natural presupposition lying in the ἔστηκεν, cf. Plin., *H. N.*, viii. 3: "It propels its body, not by manifold bending, as do other serpents, but by walking high and erect, in the midst" (Wetst.).

[2] See Critical Notes.

[3] LXX.: ἄρσην, without υἱός.

[4] "Victor over the devil who had conquered the woman" (Beda).

[5] Cf. Beng., Hengstenb., etc.

[6] De Wette, Rinck, Hengstenb., Ebrard, etc.

[7] As also xix. 15.

[8] xii. 17, xiii. 1 sqq.

dragon opposes, bringing forth Christ."—"The Church daily gives birth to a church, ruling in Christ the world." Cf. C. a Lap., Aret., Calov., who gives the more specific definition: "The bearing of the woman" refers to the "profession of the Nicene faith, and the sons born to God by the Church in the midst of the persecutions of the Gentiles," Beng., Stern., etc. Grot. also: "The dispersed from Judaea, among whom were Aquila and Apollos, instruments of the catholic Church, brought forth many of the Roman people unto Christ." Eichh., Heinr., Herd., etc., who regard the child as a symbol of the Christian Church, proceeding from the Jewish, belong here. —*καὶ ἡρπάσθη.* The expression makes clear how, by a sudden withdrawal,[1] the child is delivered from the immediately threatening danger.[2]—*πρὸς τὸν θεὸν καὶ πρὸς τὸν θρόνον αὐτοῦ.* It is made emphatic not only that the child is drawn up to God for preservation, but also that this is the surest, and at the same time most exalted, place of refuge. The allegorical interpretation of the second half of ver. 5, by those who do not acknowledge in the child the Messiah himself, must have an entirely reverse result. N. de Lyra[3] contents himself with the idea of the "deliverance of the Church;" even to him Beda's interpretation[4] may have been too perplexing. The rationalistic expositors also, who share with these churchly expositors the fundamental error concerning the *τέκνον*, uselessly amend one another.[5] De Wette, Hengstenb., Ebrard, etc., have referred the *ἡρπάσθη, κ.τ.λ.*, to the Lord's ascension, and, according to this, understand by the persecution on the part of the dragon[6] "all that was done on the part of the Jews against Christ until his death,"[7] the entire state of humiliation, to which the state of exaltation even to God's throne has succeeded.[8] But the feeling concerning this, that this conception does not correspond with the character of the statement in the text, has asserted itself in Hengstenb. Before the *καὶ ἡρπάσθη*, he says, it is to be remembered that the dragon continues his persecution, as, according to the gospel history, it has occurred from the temptation until the death on the cross.[9] "This addition is urged by ver. 4: for how was the one, who, already before the birth, stood before the woman, in order to devour her child as soon as it was born, not to incessantly continue his persecution? and it is required by the 'and it was caught up.'" But neither this addition, nor the exposition based thereon, is allowable in accordance with the text; for the textual idea is that the child immediately after birth is caught up to God's throne. This ideal representation is related to the actual history of Christ, just as the ideal allusion to the judgment impending upon Jerusalem, xi. 1 sqq., to the actually future fact; the fact

[1] Acts xxiii. 10; Jude 23.

[2] Vitr., Hengstenb.

[3] Cf. Aret., C. a Lap., etc.

[4] "Godlessness cannot apprehend Christ spiritually born in the mind of hearers, for the reason that the same one reigns with the Father in heaven, who also has raised us, and made us sit in heavenly places with Christ."

[5] Cf. Eichh.: "The Christian Church having proceeded from Judaism received, under God's protection, its growth and increase;" with Grot.: "Simon seduced so many at Rome that a Christian people no longer appeared there. They who do not appear with men are said to be with God."

[6] Cf. John xiv. 30.

[7] De Wette.

[8] Hengstenb., Ebrard.

[9] Cf. Luke iv. 13: *ἄχρι καιροῦ*, and John xiv. 30.

as such is as little prophesied there, as in this passage the proper history of Christ and its precise epochs are mentioned,[1] but in both cases the historical reality serves only for the firm concrete basis of the idea, which is the main point of consideration. No historical fact corresponds to the prophetical-ideal representation of the dragon, which watches for the birth of the Messiah, in order to immediately devour the child; but the snares on the part of Herod, and the murder of the infants at Bethlehem, may have given an occasion for the conception of the view, whereby John figuratively represents the mortal enmity of Satan to the Messiah. No fact in the history of Christ corresponds to the ἡρπάσθη τὸ τέκνον, κ.τ.λ.; but the fact of the Lord's ascension offers, as it were, the colors with which to paint the ideas as to how inexpressibly glorious is the preservation of the child from Satan, and how completely the latter, with his persecutions, is confounded. Both subjects under consideration here, Satan's mortal hatred to the Lord (and, therefore to his saints, xii. 17, xiii. 1 sqq.), and, in connection with this, Satan's inability to touch the Lord (and, accordingly, the final judgment on every thing antichristian, and the glorification of believers), are here placed in view.

What, after the withdrawal of the child, is further attempted on the part of the dragon, or what now possibly occurs with it itself (cf. ver. 7. sqq.), cannot be properly stated (ver. 7 sqq.) without giving an account first of the fate of the woman. This occurs in ver. 6, which briefly anticipates[2] what is described more minutely in ver. 14, and that too on the basis of ver. 7 sqq.;[3] for not until the dragon, with his wrath directed above all things against the child itself, is completely confounded, does he turn against the woman, ver. 13 sqq., and when she flees, then against the rest of her seed, ver. 17, in order to vent against them, as believers in Christ, that rage with which he could not reach the Lord himself and the woman. But what instruments the dragon employs, in order to attack believers with the hatred which is, in fact, directed against the Lord himself, is shown immediately afterwards in xiii. 1 sqq.

ὅπου — ἐκεῖ. Cf. ver. 14, iii. 8, vii. 2. — ἡτοιμασμένον ἀπο τ. θ., "on the part of God," divinely. Cf. Winer, p. 347 sqq. — ἵνα ἐκεῖ τρέφωσιν αὐτὴν, κ.τ.λ. The final clause depends upon the ἡτοιμ. ἀπὸ τ. θ.; the ἐκεῖ refers, therefore, to the place in the wilderness; cf. the parallel words, ver. 14 (εἰς τ. τόπον αὐτης, ὅπου τρέφεται ἐκεῖ, κ.τ.λ.), where also the personally fixed τρέφεται (sc. ἡ γυνή) explains the meaning of the τρέφωσιν αὐτὴν taken without a definite subject.[4] See, in general, also in reference to the schematic determination of time, on ver. 14.

Vv. 7–12. Not only is it in vain that the dragon lays snares for the child (ver. 5), but he is now cast down to earth by Michael and his angels, who begin a battle with him and his angels, — a crisis which, in its salutary significance for believers, is celebrated by a loud voice in heaven giving praise, but which also, as the cry of woe indicates, makes the whole earth the scene

[1] Against Auberlen, p. 277, etc.

[2] Vitr., Ewald, De Wette, Hofm., Hengstenb., Auberlen.

[3] Against Ebrard. See on ver. 14.

[4] Cf. x. 11; Luke xii. 20.

for the rage of the dragon cast upon it. — *καὶ ἐγένετο πόλεμος ἐν τ. οὐρ.* The conception that the dragon pursued the child even to the throne of God (ver. 5), and that this is the cause of the struggle which arose,[1] not only has no foundation in the context, but is also inconsistent with what is said in ver. 5, because the *κ. ἡρπάσθη* declares that the child, by its being caught up to God and God's throne, is completely secured from any further pursuit on the part of the dragon. The idea, also, that the dragon also made only the attempt to seize the child from God's own hand, is in itself not possible. But in the struggle which now arises, it is not Satan, but Michael, who appears as taking the offensive. After the dragon did what is described in vv. 3, 4, — and after the child was in complete security, — not only the dragon who had attempted the attack on the child, but also his angels, are driven out of heaven. The very circumstance that in ver. 7 the discourse is not only concerning the dragon, but also concerning his adherents, points to the fact, that the bold undertaking of the dragon (ver. 3 sq.), the most extreme to which his antichristian nature brings him, furnishes Michael and his army of angels the immediate occasion, on their part, for laying hold upon the dragon and all his angels, and casting them out of heaven. — *ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ.* For at this place the dragon is; cf. ver. 3. Every allegorical interpretation[2] brings with it a confusion of the context in details, and as a whole. Cf. also ver. 8. — *ὁ Μιχαὴλ.* The opinion of Vitringa, urgently advocated by Hengstenb., that Michael is not an angel (according to Dan. x. 13, xii. 1, the guardian angel of the O. T. people of God, according to Jude 9 an archangel), but Christ himself, or, as Hengstenb. prefers to say, the Logos, miscarries — even apart from Jude 9, where the express designation, *ὁ ἀρχάγγελος*, according to Hengstenb., is as little a proof against the divinity of Michael, as the declaration of the Lord (John xiv. 28) testifies against the *homoousia* of the Son — by its being altogether impossible to regard Michael (ver. 7) and the child (ver. 5) as one and the same person. In this passage, also, Michael the archangel[3] appears as the leader of the angelic army (*καὶ οἱ ἀγγ. αὐτου*), with which he contends for the Messiah and his kingdom. — *τοῦ πολεμῆσαι μετὰ τ. δρύκ., κ.τ.λ.* Just as undoubted as is this reading according to the MSS. at hand, is its obscurity in a grammatical respect; since the gen. infinitive *τοῦ πολεμῆσαι*, in connection with the words *ὁ Μιχ. καὶ οἱ ἀγγ. αὐτου*, is without all analogy in the Greek of the LXX. and the N. T. The seeming parallel, Acts x. 25, is distinguished from this passage by the very fact that there a proper grammatical reason is present,[4] while in this passage the connection of the gen. infinitive *τοῦ πολεμῆσαι* with the subj. *ὁ Μιχ., κ.τ.λ.*, admits of no grammatical explanation whatever; for neither the analogy of passages like Isa. xliv. 14, Jos. ii. 5, is applicable where the inf., introduced by ל, stands in definite dependence upon a pre-

[1] Eichh., Herd., De Wette, Stern.

[2] Beda: "In the *Church*, in which he says that Michael with his angels fights against the devil, because, by praying and ministering his aid, he contends, according to God's will, for the wandering Church."

[3] Beng., Ew., De Wette, Hofm., Ebrard, Auberlen, etc.

[4] As the genitive infinitive clause, in which the subject enters as an accus. (*τοῦ εἰσελθεῖν τὸν Πέτρον*), depends upon the expressly impersonal *ἐγένετο*.

ceding idea, and where the LXX. also place a finite tense,[1] nor is the supplying of the words "had war," upon which, then, the τοῦ πολεμ. is regarded as dependent,[2] allowable. If it were possible from the ἐγένετο πόλεμος to supply an ἐγένοντο before ὁ Μιχ. καὶ οἱ ἀγγ. αὐτ.,[3] or if the ἐγένετο dare be regarded as extending to ὁ Μιχ.,[4] the τοῦ πολεμῆσαι would then be correctly added.[5] But that twofold conception is so doubtful as to constrain us to the opinion that our text is defective or corrupt.[6] As a sensible conjecture, the Elz. reading, ἐπολέμησαν, commends itself, since the τοῦ before the infin. may be repeated from the preceding αὐτοῦ, and the change of the πολεμῆσαι into the form of a finite tense is without difficulty; but if the τοῦ πολεμῆσαι of the MSS. be correct, — and its difficulty favors it, — a finite tense immediately before, upon which this τοῦ πολεμ. depends, may have fallen out, possibly ἀνέστησαν or ἦλθαν, or the like, since the essential meaning is manifestly that which the versions express.[7] The conjecture is most probable, that the words πόλεμος ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ are nothing but a marginal note that has entered into the text, made in order to mark the noteworthy contents of the passage;[8] if these words be regarded as absent, the connection of the τοῦ πολ. with the καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ Μιχ. κ. οἱ ἄγγ. αὐτοῦ does not seem difficult, since the genitive of the telic infinitive[9] correctly depends upon the idea of the movement lying in the ἐγενετο.[10] This conjecture has in its favor, that the reception into the text of the doubtful words πόλεμος ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ is incomparably more probable than the falling-out of a finite tense before τοῦ πολ.; it is also to be considered, that, as in what follows, the ἐπολέμησε is formed only according to the chief subject ὁ δρ., the same phraseology is probable also in the first clause. Moreover, while it would have been difficult for John to have written ὁ Μιχ. καὶ οἱ ἄγγ. αὐτοῦ ἐπολέμησε, — for the sing., after καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ had preceded, would have been unallowable in the style of the Apoc., and besides, in connection with the following, ἐπολέμησε appears to be still more monotonous than the ἐπολέμησαν even of the Rec., — the ἐγένετο, on the other hand, in immediate connection with ὁ Μιχ. καὶ οἱ ἄγγ. meets all requirements, and commends itself especially by the fact that it gives the meaning that the attack proceeded from Michael and his angels.

Ver. 8. Properly, after the full contents of the subject ὁ δρ. καὶ οἱ ἄγγ. αὐτοῦ have preceded, the plur. form ἰσχυσαν[11] is now introduced, although the sing. ἐπολέμησε (ver. 7) stood in express relation only to the chief subject ὁ δράκων. The sense of the καὶ οὐκ ἐσχυσαν is like the Heb. phrase לֹא יָכֹל, Gen. xxxii. 26;[12]

[1] Against Ew.: "It must be fought by them." Bleek, Züll.

[2] Hengstenb.

[3] Cf. Meyer on Acts x. 25.

[4] Cf. Lücke, p. 454.

[5] Cf. Winer, p. 304.

[6] Lücke, De Wette, Winer, p. 307.

[7] Vulg.: Praeliabantur.

[8] Nevertheless, e.g., Andreas — who, moreover, has the suspicious words in the text — gives the section (vv. 7–12), the title: περὶ τοῦ πολέμου τῶν ἀγγέλων καὶ τῶν δαιμόνων, κ.τ.λ. How very usual were brief declarations in the MSS. concerning the contents, is extraordinarily manifest if the long series of lists of contents be read which occur in cod. ℵ in the Book of Acts. Cf. *Nov. Test. Gr. ex Sin. Cod.*, ed. Tischendorf, Lips., 1865; *P.*, lxxxii. A similar annotation is, e.g., Isa. xxx. 6.

[9] Cf. Acts iii. 2, 12.

[10] Cf. Acts xx. 16, xxi. 17, xxv. 15; Luke x. 32; John vi. 25, 19.

[11] Cf., directly afterwards, τόπος — αὐτων.

[12] LXX.: οὐ δύναται πρὸς αὐτόν.

Ps. xiii. 5;[1] Gen. xxx. 8:[2] "They could not prevail." — *οὐδὲ τόπος εὑρέθη αὐτῶν ἔτι ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ.* The *οὐδέ*[3] puts a second negative expression by the side of and opposite to the first, so that the meaning of the connection can be explained: Not only the dragon and his angels could not prevail, but he could no longer maintain his place in heaven: he is conquered in heaven and cast out of heaven. This idea Hengstenb. himself indicates in an entirely rationalistic way, by explaining, according to the accepted fundamental statement: "Every thing mighty is placed in heaven,"[4] as follows: "That Satan could not maintain himself in heaven, simply means that his power is broken, — broken, according to ver. 11, by the blood of Christ, whereby the forgiveness of sins is obtained, and thus his most dangerous weapon is wrested from Satan." On the other hand, a preposterous dogmatizing on this verse appears in Hofm., Ebrard, and Auberlen, who here find the presupposition, that until then,[5] Satan with his angels have *actually* had their place in heaven, make a comparison with the coming-forth of Satan in Job i., as though it were an historical fact, and, at the same time, explain from Zech. iii., that the business of Satan in heaven is that of accusing. But this idea, impossible in itself[6] to considerate Christian feeling, is gathered from the text only by the ascription of objective reality to that which is indeed improperly regarded a pure fiction,[7] yet to which only the reality of the vision belongs. The real truth on which the visionary contemplation of the discomfiture of the dragon, after the withdrawal of the Messianic child, depends, is — as may be explained from ver. 10, but in no way from ver. 11[8] — the Christian fundamental doctrine of the conquest of Satan and his kingdom by Christ, the Redeemer and Lord of the kingdom of heaven; but the subject treated in this passage (as also in vv. 3–6) is no doctrinal definition, but only the illustration, extending to the deepest foundation, of the rage of the arch-fiend against believers. Against them he turns (ver. 17 sqq.), after he has pursued in vain the Lord himself (ver. 4 sqq.) and the woman; the earth becomes the theatre of his wrath, after he has been cast thither from heaven, and that, too, as one vanquished, so that even believers can overcome the already overcome enemy, let him rage as he may. The description, vv. 7, 8 (and 9), portrays an actual, historical or superhistorical, fact, past or entirely future, which was revealed to John by his vision, no more than vv. 3–6 describe actual facts as such; but also in this passage the form of the vision in the mind of the seer seems to be morally conditioned by his remembrance of the fact, firmly established in biblical revelation, of the overthrow of the fallen angels. In itself, and as such, this fact has nothing to do with the present connection; but in the mind of the seer, the particular conception which he here expresses clothes itself in the form of that fact. [See Note LXVIII. (*b*), p. 359.]

Ver. 9. *καὶ ἐβλήθη.* After the circumstantial designation of the subject

[1] LXX.: *ἰσχυσα πρὸς αὐτόν.*
[2] LXX.: *καὶ ἠδυνάσθην.*
[3] So Winer also (pp. 457, 572) writes.
[4] Cf. Isa. xiv. 12.
[5] Until the ascension of Christ (ver. 5). Auberlen: During "the entire world-period." Ebrard.
[6] Which, especially in Ebrard, appears utterly inconceivable.
[7] Against Heinr. and other rationalists.
[8] Against Hengstenb.

has been given, the verb is repeated, and then receives also the more accurate determination, *ἐβλ. εἰς τὴν γῆν*. The aggregation of designations describe the nature and activity of the enemy as completely as possible; which is appropriate for the reason that thereby it is, on the one hand, indicated what believers have to expect from this enemy now working against them on earth,[1] and, on the other hand, it is said that this enemy, even though his hostile activity be so various, yet is already a thoroughly conquered adversary.[2] First stands the designation *ὁ δράκων ὁ μέγας*, as that of the subject given by ver. 3 sqq., with which the other designations are connected as appositives: *ὁ ὄφις ὁ ἀρχαῖος*, with an allusion to Gen. iii.,[3] whence also the rabbinical expressions חַנָּחָשׁ הַקַּדְמוֹנִי and חַנָּחָשׁ הָרִאשׁוֹן[4] are derived. — *ὁ καλούμενος διάβολος, κ.τ.λ.* The *διάβολος* stands here with the *ὁ καλούμενος* in a like manner as an appellative, just as in xx. 3 with *ὃς ἐστιν*; while, on the other hand, the *ὁ σατανᾶς*, because of the art.,[5] appears in both places as a proper noun, like *ὁ διάβολος* also in, e.g., xx. 10. The definition added to *ὁ σατ.*, viz., *ὁ πλανῶν τ. οἰκ. ὅλ.*, which is not altogether intelligible from what is said in ver. 1, but refers to the antichristic activity of Satan[6] described in ch. xiii., shows us on its part that the entire present account has its peculiar intention and meaning, not so much in itself, as rather in its connection with what follows.[7]

Vv. 10–12. A loud voice in heaven[8] celebrates the victory which has just occurred before the eye of the seer, over the adversary of Christ and his kingdom (vv. 10–12*a*), as one in which believers also are to participate, ver. 10; but this voice proclaims, also, woe to the whole earth, because the dragon cast out upon it will make use of the short time given him for his wrath (ver. 12*b*). — *ἄρτι*, "*now*," since the victory over the dragon, ver. 8 sq., as also the conclusion from ver. 10, *ὅτι ἐβλ., κ.τ.λ.*, once again expressly emphasizes. — *ἐγένετο ἡ σωτηρία, κ.τ.λ.* Incorrectly, Hofm.: "God and his Anointed have established their salvation and their power." Also De Wette, who properly refers to xi. 15, is incorrect in his remark: There is with respect to the *σωτηρία* a sort of zeugma or mingling of thoughts; the sentence, "Salvation is God," vii. 10, xix. 1, becomes in this connection: "Now it is shown that the salvation is God's." De Wette, as also those who have wished to change the meaning of *ἡ σωτηρία*, has correctly felt that it is just the idea of the *σωτηρία* whereby the mode of statement in this passage appears more difficult than in the entirely similar passage, xi. 15. But precisely as the *δύναμις* and the *βασιλεία*, so also the *σωτηρία*, i.e., salvation in the specific Christian sense, — not "victory,"[9] which *σωτηρία* does not mean, — is beheld with complete objectivity. The salvation, like the kingdom, the strength, and the power, has now become our God's, since the dragon in heaven has been overcome; now *his* salvation, his power, his kingdom, are no longer attacked and injured by the violence of the dragon up to this time unbroken, and his power not yet overcome. This is the precise mode of the

[1] Cf. ver. 12 sqq.
[2] Cf. ver. 10 sqq.
[3] Cf. 2 Cor. xi. 3.
[4] Cf. Schöttgen.
[5] Which Ew. incorrectly wants to remove.
[6] Cf. especially xiii. 14, xx. 8, 10.
[7] Ver. 17 sqq.
[8] Cf. xi. 15, 12.
[9] Eichh., Ew. ii.

presentation, along with which the other view also co-exists, that it is essentially and alone God's salvation, power, and kingdom which God seizes,[1] or which *becomes God's*. The individual ideas are very significant; ἡ σωτηρία is the salvation, not only inasmuch as saints are thereby delivered,[2] — this reference is necessary, nevertheless is too narrow, — but[3] the sum total of all righteousness, blessedness, and holiness, as they have been prepared for the creature by God through his Christ, the σωτήρ, but have been prevented from reaching the same by the dragon, the antichrist. The δύναμις, the power of God, has been manifested in his victory over the dragon;[4] the βασιλεία, "where God's majesty shows itself,"[5] is the royal glory of God,[6] which is peculiar to him as the possessor of unconditioned power, and which he displays especially in creation and the imparting of salvation.[7] The ἐξουσία is ascribed to God's Christ, because it is the definite, supreme power[8] peculiar to God's Christ as such.[9] The reason for the ascription of praise, ἄρτι ἐγένετο, κ.τ.λ., lies in what is reported in vv. 8, 9; for the entire undertaking of the dragon[10] was nothing else than the truly antichristian attempt to frustrate the σωτηρία, to bid defiance to the δύναμις of God, to oppose his βασιλεία, and to bring to naught the ἐξουσία of Christ, ay, Christ himself. From a new side, not at all touched in ver. 3 sqq., and also very remote from that presentation, is the overcome adversary designated by the appellation ὁ κατήγωρ τ. ἀδελφ. ἡμ., κ.τ.λ. The form of the word is Hebraistic: קטיגור. Precisely analogous is the rabbinical designation of Michael as the סניגור, the συνήγωρ, i.e., συνήγορος, advocate, of the godly.[11] In the later Greek there is also the analogous form διάκων for διάκονος.[12] — τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἡμῶν. The brethren of those by whom, in a loud voice, the song of praise is raised, are undoubtedly believers in the earthly life, for only they could be exposed to the accusation on the part of Satan; but an inference as to the designation of the heavenly persons who speak of believing men as their brethren is not to be made: it can in no way be decided as to whether the adoring voice proceeds from the angels,[13] or from the twenty-four elders,[14] or perhaps from the already perfected saints,[15] — who, however, would not be regarded as saints only of the O. T.[16] The idea of a *perpetual*[17] accusation of the godly on the part of Satan,[18] which occurs neither in the N. nor the O. T. as an express doctrinal article, is derived and formulated by Jewish theology from Zech. iii. and Job i., ii.[19] The N. T. contains an allusion to that conception only so far as the names ordinarily used in the N. T., ὁ διάβολος and ὁ σατανᾶς, also ὁ ἀντικεί-

[1] Cf. (xi. 17) the τ. δύν. σου in connection with the εἴληφας.

[2] Beng. Cf. Hengstenb., Ebrard.

[3] Cf. the similar passages vii. 10, xix. 1.

[4] Cf. Beng.

[5] Beng.

[6] xi. 15, 17.

[7] Cf. i. 6, v. 10.

[8] Cf. xiii. 2, where ἐξ. stands for the definite supreme power existent in a commission, office, etc.

[9] Cf. xiii. 2, where ἐξ. is with δύναμις; vi. 8, ix. 3, xi. 6, xiv. 18, xvii. 19, xx. 6, where ἐξ. is used with respect to definite supreme authority lying in a commission, office, etc.

[10] Ver. 3 sqq.

[11] Cf. Schöttg.

[12] Cf. Wetst. [13] Beda, etc.

[14] Ew. i., etc.

[15] Ew. ii., according to vi. 4 sqq., vii. 9 sqq

[16] Beng.

[17] ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός. Cf. iv. 8.

[18] *Sohar Levit.*, p. 43: "He *always* stands as accuser before the king of Israel" (in Schöttg.).

[19] Cf. examples in Schöttg.

μενος, according to their original significance, point back to the same. In the latter circumstance, sufficient scriptural ground for receiving the accusing activity of Satan in dogmatical seriousness can be acknowledged only if the Scriptures were elsewhere to show expressly that they advocate such definite sense for that name already firmly fixed. But this occurs neither in Job i., ii., nor in Zech. iii.; for the former mythically fashioned passage does not treat at all of a peculiar accusation, while, according to the nature of the subject, objective reality does not pertain to the vision of the prophet. Scripture, therefore, does not give us a doctrinal article, which would be just as incomprehensible to Christian thought, as the idea of an actual abode of the devil and his angels in heaven.[1] But as there, so also here, every allegorizing interpretation of the text is to be rejected,[2] and it is to be decided, according to the analogy of Scripture, that the idea of a perpetual accusation of believers by Satan, derived in its concrete formation from Jewish theology, makes no claim of objective truth, but is to be regarded as a point of the prophetic conception founded in the individuality of John.

Ver. 11. Καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐνίκησαν αὐτὸν. That the αὐτοι refers to τ. ἀδελφῶν ἡμ., and, therefore, those accused by the dragon (ὁ κατηγ. αὐτούς, ver. 10), but not the angel Michael (ver. 7), are here represented as those who *have conquered*[3] the dragon, results not only from the words in themselves, which do not allow an immediate reference of the αὐτοὶ to a subject in ver. 7, but also from the manner of the conflict and the victory indicated, which does not at all agree with what is described in ver. 7.[4] From the identity of those accused in ver. 10, and contending in ver. 11, it does not follow, however, that the idea of ἐνίκησαν αὐτον is: "They have won the case against him," as Beng.[5] wishes; but the idea of the νικᾶν here is the same as everywhere in the Apoc., which regards every kind of temptation which Satan has prepared for believers as a mighty conflict,[6] and therefore every confirmation of faith as a victory over the arch-enemy.[7] On the fundamental conception, 1 John ii. 13, 14, is to be compared, although, as the form, so also the reference there is different. The perf. νενικήκατε τὸν πονηρόν describes the life of faith then existing in Christian young men, as having for its foundation the victory obtained over the wicked one by faith itself; the aor. ἐνίκησαν αὐτὸν, however, by placing the victory over Satan as a definite fact entirely in the past, is *said* by a prolepsis similar to that whereby, in vii. 9 sqq., believers are *beheld* in a proleptical vision after the victory has been won.[8] In fact, the ἐνίκησαν is applicable not until the conflict lasting unto death, requiring the surrender of life in fidelity to the cause,[9] is actually fought

[1] Cf. ver. 7 sqq.

[2] Against Beda: "He suggests both that they abuse prosperity, and in adversity do not have patience." De Wette: "Satan is at the same time wicked lust and the bad conscience."

[3] Beng., Ew., De Wette, Hengstenb., Ebrard.

[4] Cf. the closing words of ver. 11.

[5] Cf. Rom. iii. 4. [6] Cf. ver. 17.

[7] xv. 2. Cf., in general, the νικᾶν in the epistle, chs. ii., iii.

[8] When Klief. here opposes a prolepsis, this must be taken together with the fact, that, understanding the woman (ver. 1) as Christianity of the last times, i.e., of believers mentioned in ver. 11, purified by suffering, he finds in the entire vision a representation of actual circumstances and events of the end. In this sense, he considers, e.g., the victory of Michael (ver. 7) as the execution of the moral victory *previously* gained by believers (ver. 11).

[9] Cf. close of ver. 11.

through, and the garment washed in the blood of the Lamb[1] has been kept pure in spite of all the temptations and persecutions on the part of Satan. But although the worshippers know that the conflict against the dragon still in reality impends over their brethren on earth,[2] yet they can celebrate the victory of believers as one already gained, because the victory won over Satan in heaven[3] has rendered him an overcome enemy also to believers on earth. Since thus the victory still in fact to be won by believers — to which properly all the consolatory language of the Apoc. refers — is celebrated by these heavenly voices as already obtained, the strongest encouragement is given believers. Hence ver. 11 appears not as a "digression,"[4] but is in every respect appropriate. — *διὰ τὸ αἷμα τοῦ ἀρνίου, κ.τ.λ.* On account of the *διά* with the accus., the blood of the Lamb and the word of testimony of believers appears not as the means (*διά* with gen.), but as the reason or cause on account of which the victory is won. This form of the presentation is no less suitable than the former;[5] but in the first member *διὰ τὸ αἷμα τ. ἀρν.*, the latter corresponds much more accurately with the inner connection, sustained by ver. 11, to what precedes. Entirely analogous is the relation in iii. 21 between the *ὁ νικῶν, κ τ.λ.*, and the *ὡς κἀγὼ ἐνίκησα, κ.τ.λ.* The victory of believers on earth is based upon the victory won over Satan in heaven; the peculiar truth, however, in what is reported from ver. 7 on, and in the closest connection with ver. 5, — that, viz., which, beneath the shell of the occurrences beheld, must be properly understood as the actual cause of the victory for believers on earth, — is Christ's victory over Satan. This victory the Lamb has won over the dragon by shedding his blood. The blood of the Lamb is therefore the cause of the victory of believers.[6] In the same way the statement is added: *καὶ διὰ τὸν λόγον τῆς μαρτυρίας αὐτων.* Here we would expect the gen., because the testimony given by believers presents itself most simply as the means whereby they conquer. De Wette is inclined to assume this mode of representation by "a sort of zeugma," which he tries to maintain in the *διά*. But the *διά* with the accus. has its complete justification, because the word of the testimony of believers, like the blood of the Lamb, can appear as the objective ground of their victory, since it is the word of the testimony given by believers with all fidelity even unto death,[7] yet, also, at the same time, the word of such testimony as believers have previously received, which they now have as the condition of their victory beyond and above themselves.[8] Thus the word of testimony has also an objective side, according to which it appears, like the blood of the Lamb, as the ground, not as the means, of their victory; while, on the other hand, the blood of the Lamb can be considered the actual ground of the victory only when the subjective side, viz., the believing participation in this blood, or the being washed thereby,[9] is kept in mind. — *καὶ οὐκ ἠγά-*

[1] Cf. vii. 4.
[2] Cf. ver. 12, and, besides, ver. 17.
[3] Ver. 7 sqq. [4] De Wette.
[5] Against De Wette.
[6] Utterly preposterously Ew. rationalizes by remarking on the *ἐνίκησαν αὐτ. διὰ τ. αἷμα τ. ἀρν.*: "By Christianity established by Christ's death, which was also an example to them."
[7] This is the meaning of the *αὐτῶν* with *τ. λ. τ. μαρτ.*
[8] Cf. ver. 17.
[9] Cf. vii. 14, i. 5; *Var. Lect.*

πησεν, κ.τ.λ. The not loving their souls, i.e., readiness to surrender life replacing ἄχρι θανάτου.[1] As faithful witnesses, therefore, they suffered death, and just by this, like the Lord himself, won the victory.[2]

Ver. 12. Διὰ τοῦτο. We cannot regard the ground of joy for the heavens, and those dwelling therein (οἱ ἐν αὐτοῖς σκηνοῦντες are only those whose actual place of abode is the heavens, and who there, as the expression σκηνοῦν indicates, have glorious rest disturbed by no woe or conflict,[3] but not also believers on earth, as Hengstenb., by a false comparison with Phil. iii. 20, Eph. ii. 6, explains), to be both the casting of the dragon out of heaven (ver. 9), and the victory of believers (ver. 11),[4] but only the former;[5] for although ver. 11, in connection with ver. 10, proleptically celebrates the victory of earthly believers over the dragon, based upon the heavenly victory over the same, the affair is displayed here as it is in reality; to the heavenly beings alone belongs the pure joy, while woe is proclaimed to the whole earth and all its inhabitants, even to believers on earth; for just these have now to struggle even unto blood with the enraged dragon. — οὐαὶ τὴν γῆν, κ.τ.λ. The accus., which in Greek[6] as well as in Latin occurs regularly in exclamations, is unusual here only so far as it stands with οὐαί, which is otherwise usually combined with the dat. — τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλ. In opposition to the heavenly world,[7] the entirety of the earthly world is designated, in connection with which there is no reference to the relation of the two particular parts as such; much less is any allegorical interpretation admissible.[8] — ὅτι κατέβη, κ.τ.λ. Reason for the cry of woe: the earth and sea are to be the theatre for the activity of the devil, now allotted to this sphere, who will give vent to his great wrath the more as he knows that he has only a brief time. Instead of the ἐβλήθη, a κατέβη naturally occurs here, because, as a dreadful activity of the enraged enemy is portrayed, it is more appropriate that it should not be expressly marked that the descent of the enemy is involuntary. — ἔχων θυμὸν μέγαν. The great wrath belonging to the dragon because of his antichristic nature, he has shown already (ver. 4). By the overthrow described in ver. 7 sqq., this wrath can only be inflamed anew. To this is added the fact, that the dragon knows that only a short time is allowed him. To identify this ὀλίγον καιρόν with the 3½ days mentioned in xvii. 11 "as the time of antichrist,"[9] is as arbitrary as the reckoning of Bengel, who takes "the short time," as somewhat longer than the 3½ times (ver. 14), i.e., equal to four times, or four times 222⅔ years, and regards the period from the year 947 to the year 1836. But in the meaning of the Apoc., the shortness of the time given Satan for his antichristian work on earth, depends simply upon the fact that "the time is at hand," or that the Lord is soon coming to judge Satan together with his instruments.[10]

Vv. 13–17. The dragon, cast down to the earth, pursues first the woman

[1] Cf. ii. 10; Phil. ii. 8.
[2] Cf. iii. 21, i. 18, v. 5, vi. 9.
[3] Cf. xiii. 6, vii. 15, xxi. 3. Beng., Ew., De Wette.
[4] Beng. [5] De Wette.
[6] Cf. Matth., *Ausführl. Gramm.*, sec. 427.
[7] Cf. vii. 2 sq., v. 13.
[8] Against Beng., who understands here by "earth and sea," Asia and Europe. Cf. Hengstenb., who regards the sea as the sea of nations.
[9] Ebrard.
[10] Cf., in general, i. 3, xxii. 20; especially xvii. 11, xx. 1 sqq.

fleeing into the wilderness; but as she also, like the child (ver. 5), is delivered from his snares, he turns to the conflict against the rest of her seed.

Καὶ ὅτε εἶδεν. The dragon, finding himself cast upon the earth, must first perceive that thereby all his persecution of the child itself would become impossible; so he employs himself with pursuing (ἐδίωξε, aor.) the woman, just because she was the mother of that man-child.[1]

Ver. 14. Already in the ἐδίωξε τὴν γυν. (ver. 13), lies the presupposition afforded by the preceding account (ver. 6), concerning the *flight* of the woman; but now as the subject is properly concerning the fate of the woman, that which in ver. 6 is touched upon only in the main point, and by anticipation, is expressly described. For ver. 14 does not speak of something entirely different from ver. 6, — as Ebrard thinks, who finds in ver. 6 the flight of the woman to heaven, i.e., the emblem of the dispersion of Israel on earth, but in ver. 14 the flight into the desert on earth, i.e., a miraculous deliverance of converted Israel on the actual earth; an interpretation which already fails, in that, in ver. 6, it takes heaven together with the wilderness misplaced therein by Ebrard figuratively, but in ver. 14, on the other hand, the earth (cf. ver. 13), in the proper sense, while the wilderness found in the same must again be understood figuratively, although it is manifest that all these local designations must, at all events, be understood in the same way, — but that ver. 14 gives the proper execution, and that, too, in the natural place of the connection, of that which was shortly before in ver. 6 removed not without reason,[2] results from a comparison of the two verses. Precisely the same is the goal of the flight; the τόπος αὐτῆς in the wilderness is the place prepared there for the woman on God's part;[3] the same in meaning are the schematic dates — for the determination of 3½ times, i.e., years (derived also, according to the expression,[4] from the figurative passages, Dan. vii. 25, xii. 7), agrees with the 1,260 days (ver. 6);[5] the same, also, as to what is meant with the brief ἔφυγεν εἰς τ. ἔρ., κ.τ.λ., ver. 6, is the detailed description, ver. 14: καὶ ἐδόθησαν — ἵνα πέτηται εἰς τ. ἔρ., κ.τ.λ. The certainty of the flight arranged by God depends upon the fact, that to the woman two wings of a great eagle are given, in order that — for such is the intention of God in his deliverance, by causing wings to be given the woman — she might fly to the place prepared for her on God's part in the wilderness. The idea itself has grown by the plastic art of the writer of the Apoc. from the figure given in Exod. xix. 4:[6] As God formerly bore his people, when they fled from the Egyptians, on eagles' wings, so, for her sure escape, a pair of eagle's wings is given the woman fleeing from the dragon. Yet it dare not be said that the art. τοὺ ἀ., τοὺ μεγ., makes the eagle named here appear identical with that mentioned (Exod. xix. 4),[6] for in that figurative passage a par-

[1] ἥτις. Cf. the accurate use of this relative also, ix. 4, iii. 24, xix. 2, xx. 4.

[2] Beng., Ewald, De Wette, Hofm., Hengstenb., Auberlen.

[3] The pres. τρέφεται, whose definite relation Ewald, Hofm., etc., try to invalidate, is just as intelligible as the pres. ἔχει; ver. 6. In the meaning of John, the woman is present in her place in the wilderness; there she remains concealed during the entire time of trouble for believers (cf. ver. 17), which continues for just three and one-half times.

[4] Cf. Winer, p. 167.

[5] Cf. also xi. 2, 3.

[6] Cf. also Deut. xxxii. 11; Ps. xxxvi. 8.

[7] Züll., Ew. ii.

ticular eagle is not designated. Ewald's former opinion, also, that the art. in the Hebrew way[1] designates superlatively a very great eagle, is not admissible, because the analogy — even though it corresponded better than is actually the case — would give only a purely superlative idea.[2] Ebrard has developed from his view, that the art. designates the very eagle mentioned already in viii. 13, the thought that "the rescue of the woman would follow in the moment when the final extraordinary developments of the fifth and sixth trumpets are to begin;" or, as he also says, that the woman "shall be sustained by the strength of the eagle which is to bring judgment upon the godless world." But even apart from the two interpretations, lying at the basis of the false presumption that the soaring of the woman away into the wilderness is, according to fact and time, to be entirely distinguished from the escape into the wilderness, neither the one nor the other interpretation is possible, because in this passage that eagle cannot be meant, which in viii. 13 appears for a very special end, and one entirely foreign to what is stated in this passage. What is said can be concerning no particular eagle; the art is intended generically,[3] as i. 1.[4] Two wings, like those of the great eagle, were given the woman, for rapid and sure escape. On this account, also, we are not to think of the eagle mentioned in Ezek. xvii. 3, 7, where, in a parable, the kings of Babylon and Egypt are represented as eagles; the thought accordingly developed by Auberlen[5] from this passage, that the secular power itself — more specifically, "the two parts of the Roman Empire in the East and West, especially since Constantine" — must afford the woman, i.e., the Christian Church, a secure place by means of Roman civil and legal order, is consequently with as little foundation in the phraseology of the text, as the point of vision in general, which this form of exposition assumes, corresponds with the intention and contents of the entire ch. xii. — *ἵνα πέτηται εἰς τὴν ἔρημον, κ.τ.λ.* As the nature of the escape, viz., by flying on eagle's wings, so is also the place of refuge described according to the model of the deliverance of Israel out of Egypt in the wilderness. To the privations incident to the abode in the wilderness, the *ὅπου τρέφεται, κ.τ.λ.*, does not refer;[6] the only point made, is that the place prepared by God in the wilderness, for the fleeing woman, is a sure place of refuge against the persecution of the dragon, and that — as God formerly nourished his people in the wilderness — the woman would be nourished in this place of refuge, during the time determined on the part of God. — *ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ ὄφεως.* This determination is not to be combined with the remote *πέτηται*,[7] but with the immediately preceding *ὅπου τρέφεται, κ.τ.λ.*,[8] and, therefore, to be explained like the Heb. מִפְּנֵי, Judg. ix. 21:[9] "out of the sight of the serpent," i.e., far and concealed from it. No addition is to be made,

[1] Judg. vi. 15; 1 Sam. xvii. 14.

[2] "The absolutely great, i.e., the greatest."

[3] De Wette.

[4] *διὰ τοῦ ἀγγ. αὐτ.*

[5] Cf. Aret., Beng.

[6] Against Hengstenb., etc., who, like Auberlen, wants to find it indicated that the "time of the Church's desolation," i.e., the "entire heathen-Christian, or Church-historical period," is only a time of pilgrimage to the glory of the heavenly Canaan.

[7] Vitr., Züll.

[8] Beng., Ew., De Wette, Hengstenb.

[9] LXX.: *ἔφυγεν — καὶ ᾤκησεν ἐκεῖ ἀπὸ προσώπου Ἀβ.*

at least as Hengstenb. does: "at its flight or in its fear;" the concise mode of statement presupposes the flight as already accomplished, and states how the escaped woman now tarries in security.

Ver. 15, 16. The dragon cannot reach the woman flying on eagle's wings; and, therefore, casts a stream of water out of his mouth after her, in order to destroy her. But also by this danger the woman remains unharmed, because the earth absorbs the stream. — *ὡς ποταμόν.* This description of the great amount of water cast forth by the serpent serves to explain and illustrate the purpose: *ἵνα ταύτην ποταμοφόρητον ποιήσῃ,* "to sink her carried away by the waters of the river," as Vitr. appropriately explains the word,[1] not occurring elsewhere in biblical Greek, but otherwise regularly formed. Hesych.[2] explains the Homeric *ἀπόερσεν*[3] by *ποταμορφόρητον ἐποίησεν.* — The help afforded the woman imperilled on the part of the earth is described in a way, ver. 16, which is conformable with the nature of the danger, as well also with the nature of the earth; the earth opens its mouth, and drinks up the stream of water. The idea recalls not so much Gen. iv. 11,[4] as rather Num. xvi. 30, 32,[5] since it is thought the mighty flood of water vanishes suddenly and inefficaciously in the widely gaping earth. — The question concerning the genesis of this entire description, vv. 15, 16, is essentially a preliminary question, if it be as to whether a prophecy actually to be fulfilled be found here. The allegorists make the matter too easy by comparing the water cast forth from the mouth of the serpent directly with the many waters, xvii. 1, on which the great harlot sits, and which are there (ver. 15) expressly explained as a figure of many nations, and who thus reach the opinion that in this passage also the stream of water signifies a stream of people which will roll against the Church, whether they be satisfied with this general sense,[6] or more definite references be introduced.[7] —

[1] Cf. the analogous *ἀνεμοφόρητος.*

[2] Ed. Alberti, i. 461.

[3] *Il.*, iv. 348.

[4] Züll.

[5] *ἀνοίξασα ἡ γῆ τὸ στόμα αὐτῆς κατεπίεσαι αὐτούς, κ.τ.λ.—ἠνοίχθη ἡ γῆ καὶ κατέπιεν αὐτ.*

[6] Hengstenb., Ebrard. Cf. Beda: "The force of persecutions." Andreas: *ἀθέων ἀνδρῶν ἢ πονηρῶν δαιμονων ἢ ποικίλων πειρασμῶν πλῆθος* ["the abundance of godless men, or wicked demons, or various trials"] coming out of the mouth of the serpent," i.e., *ἐκ προστάγματος αὐτου* ["by its command"], as Vict. already indicates. C. a Lap.: "The army of Antichrist." Stern: "The flood of godless nations and infernal spirits."

[7] Calov.: "The Arian heretics." Vitr.: "The Saracens, who (ver. 16) were defeated by Charles Martel." Coccejus: "The armies of Maxentius and Licinius, which were defeated by Constantine the Great, and, indeed (ver. 16: *ἡ γῆ*), with the forces of the lands in which (ver. 14) the Church had already found a refuge, viz., Gaul and Spain." Bengel: "The Turks from the year 1058 on." Wetst.: "The armies of Cestius and Vespasian." Hammond: "Recent persecutions after the Neronian (ver. 3) on the part of the Romans, who, however (ver. 16), were withdrawn from the Christians by the Jewish war." Ew. ii.: "The flight of the mother congregation from Jerusalem to Pella." Cf. Euseb., *H. E.*, iii. 5. In connection with this, ver. 15 is referred to some great danger on the Jordan, possibly an attack by a faction of desperate Jews. Ew. interprets the delivering earth, but not more definitely. Auberlen: "The migration of nations, whose flood, however, is not destructive to the Church, because the earth, i.e., the cultured Roman world, received those wild Germanic masses within itself, subdued their hostility, mellowed them, and won them to Christianity." But even granting that the allegorical mode of exposition is justified, and that in vv. 15 and 16 definite events of secular history are foretold, is it possible that the writer of the Apoc. could have conceived of the thought that the masses of nations which Satan casts forth against the Church are "won to Christianity"? This glaring contradiction

By any allegorical interpretation whatever, we are of course prevented from making of the description in ver. 15 sqq. a prophecy actually to be fulfilled, because of the similar descriptions which precede in vv. 1-6, vv. 7-12, vv. 13, 14, not allowing such interpretation. The stream of water from the mouth of the serpent designates as little something actually occurring in the present or in the future of John as the two wings of the eagle which, in ver. 14, were given the woman; but, as there the escape of the woman is represented with a plastic art, which is developed from the allusion to the O. T. testimony concerning God's preservation of his people, so John here describes the danger which Satan, in his rage, prepares for the woman still fleeing, in such a way as to form living images from the symbolical mode of speech of the O. T. Entirely remote is any allusion to the passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea;[1] but in passages like Ps. xviii. 5–17, xxxii. 6, xlii. 8, cxxiv. 4, where pressing dangers are illustrated under the figure of great floods of water, lies the origin of the peculiar conception of the Apoc. idea; even its concrete form has a certain analogy in Ps. xviii. 5, where what is said of "the cords of death" and "the floods of ungodliness" is in the same figurative sense as "the cords of hell," and "the snares of death." In such views we may recognize the foundation given the fantasy of the prophet, upon which his actual vision is ordinarily based.[2]

Ver. 17. The dragon, inflamed only to greater rage (*καὶ ὠργίσθη τῇ γυναικὶ*) against the fleeing woman (ver. 16), because of the frustration of his last attack, applies himself to a conflict with "the rest of her seed which keep the commandments of God, and hold the testimony of Jesus." — For the correct explanation of the expression *τ. λοιπῶν τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτῆς, κ.τ.λ.*, — and also for the determination thence, according to the context, of the idea of the *γυνή*, — we must first of all maintain, against Ebrard, that the *σπέρμα αὐτῆς* is not a seed from which also the woman springs, but only the seed springing from the woman, i.e., born of her, can be designated; so that the *λοιποὶ τοῦ σπερμ. αὐτης* could in no way be those "who belong to the same seed with the woman." In violation of the context, Auberlen[3] further judges the *λοιπ. τ. σπ. αὐτ.* to be "the disciples of the Lord who have survived the earlier persecutions" (vv. 13-16); for if the hostility described in vv. 13-16 is directed against the woman herself, not her seed, that hostility remains entirely unsuccessful,[4] so that the subject here cannot be "survivors" in general. This also against Hengstenb., who concedes two different references: "The rest are they who survive the hostile inundation in ver. 15, or are not touched by it." — A guide to the more specific determination of the *λοιποὶ τ. σπέρμ. αὐτ.* is contained in the words *τῶν τηρούντων — Ἰησοῦ*, if the sense be correctly stated by Ewald, whom Züll. follows: "Of those uniting with the

is not removed by the fact that Christianity is to come into consideration "chiefly, not on its heavenly, but on its earthly side, as a force of civilization" (Auberlen, p. 297). And with respect to actual history dare it be said that the Germanic nations were cast forth like a stream of water out of the jaws of Satan, and were swallowed up by the earth? Does it agree with this, that from this Satanic stream of water the German Reformation emerged? It is a supposition more worthy of being entertained, when Aub., p. 300, recurs to the Turks.

[1] Against Ew., De Wette, etc.

[2] Cf. Introduction, p. 47 sq.

[3] p. 298.

[4] Cf. ver. 17.

more eager and wholesome study of Mosaic laws firm faith in Jesus the Messiah;" but the expression is entirely too general,[1] than that thereby merely Jewish Christians be designated. — The relation, especially presented by the context, of the statement τ. λοιπῶν τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτ., viz., to the man-child which, according to ver. 5, belongs to the seed of the woman as the first-born, has been acknowledged with complete definiteness only by Zull.;[2] yet while he has correctly explained only the form, but not, at the same time, the subject, he enables us to recognize the occasion because of which this most simple contrast of "the rest" of the seed of the woman, and that first-born brother, the Messiah himself,[3] has not been obvious to expositors, viz., the difficulty of correctly conceiving of the woman in the relation as well to the man-child (ver. 5) as also to "the rest of her seed." The γυνή herself, her υἱός, and the λοιποὶ τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτῆς, are three ideas so essentially connected that the misunderstanding of one necessarily hinders the correct explanation of the rest. In general, there is no doubt possible as to the fact that the *son* of the woman is the Messiah; but, nevertheless, that the Virgin Mary is not on this account to be understood by the woman, — even though the ideal contemplation of the writer of the Apoc. always gives the historical person of the Virgin a certain support, — Andr., in agreement with Methodius, has already noted. Any such reference to the person of Mary is rendered impossible, on the one hand, by the ideal description of the γυνή herself, and the events pertaining to her; on the other, by her relation to "the rest of her seed." By the latter statement — as the λοιποὶ τ. σπ. αὐτ. is designated not only by the final clause of ver. 17, but also by what succeeds in ch. xiii., as, at all events, believers in Christ — the expositors are led with essential unanimity to recognition of the fact that the γυνή designates the "Church," in analogy with the mode of contemplation, according to which, in the O. T., the congregation of God's people appears as the wife of Jehovah, and in the Apoc. itself[4] as the bride of the Lord. If now the question be as to the more specific comprehension of this, in general, obvious idea of the γυνή, as well according to the measure of significant features in the description of the γυνή herself,[5] as also in relation to her man-child, and the rest of her seed; in the first place, all the expositors err who, in the γυνή, wish to recognize the *Christian* Church, whether they expressly distinguish it from the Jewish or O. T. Church,[6] and limit the description to the antichristic period at the end of the world,[7] or regard the N. T. Church in essential connection with that of the O. T., the latter not without its N. T. continuation, and both as one inseparable comprehensive Church.[8] A characteristic sign that these two modifications of the

[1] Cf. xiv. 12, xxii. 14. Concerning the correct meaning of ἐχ. τ. μαρτ. Ἰησ., cf., against Ewald especially, vi. 9, xix. 10.

[2] "The rest of her seed, the Zionites on earth, in contrast with the child above removed."

[3] Cf. Matt. xxviii. 10; Heb. ii. 11, 12.

[4] xxii. 17.

[5] Cf. ver. 1.

[6] Beda, N. de Lyra, Aret., Hammond, Calov., Vitr., Beng., etc.

[7] C. a Lap., Stern.

[8] Victorin., Andr., De Wette, Hengstenb., Auberlen, Christiani: "The Church of the last time." Cf. also the inconsistencies of Coccejus, who, in ver. 14, suddenly speaks of the N. T. Church, although he had referred what preceded to the O. T.; of Eichh., who

exposition essentially cohere, lies in the fact that men like Vitringa and Auberlen share the error that the twelve stars (ver. 1) refer to the twelve apostles.[1] But the view that the woman is the N. T. Church, inevitably miscarries in ver. 5; for it is impossible[2] to refer the birth of the Messiah to Christ's attaining life and form *in believers*.[3] For this reason,[4] the reference to the O. T. Church has been received; but, on the one hand, the difficulty concerning the original exposition arising from ver. 5[5] is not properly removed, and, on the other, a new difficulty is developed. For, if the γυνή be the O. and N. T. Church universal, who are then the λοιπ. τ. σπ. αὐτ., ver. 17? The opinion of Bleek, De Wette, and Hengstenb., also of Klief.,— according to which an actual distinction could not be made between the woman and the rest of her seed, since the woman herself is nothing but the sum of her children, and by ἡ γυνή the whole, while by οἱ λοιπ. τ. σπ. αὐτ. the particular members of the whole, are designated,[6] — Auberlen[7] defends upon the ground that only in this way can it be explained why the dragon who was enraged with the woman turns against her seed. But the text does directly the opposite in offering a distinction between the woman and her seed. The woman (ver. 16) is hidden from injury on the part of the dragon; just because he sees that he cannot reach the woman herself, he inflicts his wrath, which undoubtedly is directed against the woman, upon another subject still within reach, viz., the rest of the woman's children. Is it not very readily to be understood, if the dragon wishes now to distress the mother by injuring her children? — The γυνή who bore the Messiah (ver. 5), and has still other seed (ver. 17), can be only the O. T. Church of God, the true Israel.[8] John was taught already by the ancient prophetic representation, to ascribe seed to this Church, and to regard her as mother of her children, the believing and godly;[9] the description, also, in vv. 2, 5, has originated not without an allusion to Mic. v. 1 sqq. But nevertheless, in the writer of the Apocalypse, the view, with all its analogy to the ancient prophetic types, appears peculiarly defined, viz., because he represents heathen Christians (the λοιπ. τ. σπ. αὐτ., Hofm., Ebrard), as belonging to the seed of the woman, and in so far the brethren of the Messiah.[10] Here John would have a very

already, in ver. 5, inserts "the Christian Church which proceeded from Judaism," etc.

[1] "The apostolic Church" (Vitr., p. 566).

[2] To say nothing as to the proposition that the "birth" of Christ may be his return to judgment, as the result of the course of the Christian Church through time, as Klief. (*Zeitschr.*, a. a. O. S., 547) indicates by understanding by the γυνή the people of God in Christendom. Cf. on ver. 11.

[3] Against Beda, Stern, etc.

[4] Cf., e.g., Auberlen, p. 277: "By the woman who bore Jesus, we are naturally to understand the Church of God in its O. T. form;" on the other hand, p. 280: "The Church also in its N. T. form."

[5] For, the more earnestly the essential unity of the O. and N. T. Church of God is asserted, the less proper is it to ascribe that exclusively to the first part of this Church which cannot be ascribed to the second part.

[6] Cf., on the other hand, Ewald.

[7] p. 289.

[8] Cf. Herder, Heinr., Ewald, Züll., Hofm., Ebrard; also Bleek, Vorles., Volkm., Hilgenf.: "The original Church in Palestine."

[9] Cf. Isa. liv. 1, 13, lxvi. 8.

[10] Volkm., who indorses this explanation, attempts, however, to harmonize this passage with the assumed Judaism of the Apoc. by requiring us to regard heathen Christians as metics subordinate to the citizens of the kingdom of God. Hilgenf. prefers to keep clear of this distinction here, and to think only of the daughter-congregation in general contrast with that of the Palestinian mother-church. —

suitable model in Mic. v. 3, as the יֶתֶר אֶחָיִן[1] designates the growth of the Church from the heathen, who are added to the mother Church as though born of her seed. For the evangelical-prophetical fundamental view, cf. Isa. ii. 2 sqq.; Zech. viii. 20 sqq.; John iv. 22, etc. Against this conception, it dare not be said, that nevertheless not only believers from the heathen are brethren of the Messiah, that consequently — beneath the acknowledgment of the reference of *οἱ λοιποὶ τ. σπέρμ. αὐτ.*, to the child of the woman mentioned in ver. 5 — the *λοιποί* are, in any case, to be regarded Jewish and heathen Christians; for the ordinary view, according to which *all* believers are brethren of the Lord, is not presented here as certainly as is the ideal person of the *γυνή*, the mother of the Messiah, the O. T. Church of God, in whose complete unity Jewish Christians are regarded as the genuine Israelites. [See Note LXIX., p. 359.]

Only now[2] is the purpose of what is described in vv. 1–17, with respect to what follows, to be clearly recognized. In ver. 17 (*ἀπῆλθε, κ.τ.λ.*), this distinctly comes to light. By the vision of ch. xii., Satan himself is designated as the proper exciter of the *πόλεμος* (ver. 17) of the *θλῖψις*, which believers have yet to expect before the coming of their Lord. And, besides, a specific determination of the *πόλεμος*, whose description is here introduced, lies in the fact, that, on the one hand, Satan appears in the form which he had attained in the Roman Empire (ver. 3), as, then, on the other hand, those Christians are designated as the goal of the dragon's rage who came from the Gentiles to the sonship of Israel (ver. 17), and are to be found within the bounds of that empire. But how Satan now excites war, and what instruments he puts in motion, is made manifest directly afterwards, viz., in ch. xiii., which begins with the words that in the later editions form the close of ch. xii. (ver. 18).

Notes by the American Editor.

LXVIII. (*a.*) Ver. 1 sq. *γυνὴ περιβεβλημένη, κ.τ.λ.*

See the full discussion by Düsterdieck at the close of the chapter, who restricts the *γυνὴ* to the O. T. Church. So Luthardt. Alford marks a transition to another view there stated: "The whole symbolism points to the Church, the bride of God; and of course, from the circumstances afterwards related, the O. T. Church, at least *at the beginning of the vision*." Lange very tersely puts the argument for the O. and N. T. Church in undivided unity: "The fact that the woman cannot be referred to the *New Testament Church* alone, results clearly from ver. 5: the Christian Church did not bear Christ. Holding fast the identity of her in the *heaven* and her in the *wilderness*, neither can the woman be significant of the O. T. Church by itself, since the same woman lives on in the wilderness throughout the N. T. period of the cross. The *unity* of the O. and N. T. Church of God lay, doubtless, much nearer to the contemplation of John than to that of an exegesis whose view is, in many respects, too exclusively

Both are unsuitable to this passage, since here the opposition to the received anti-Pauline Judaism of the Apoc. is presented.

[1] "The rest of his [the Messiah's] brethren." LXX., incorrectly: *οἱ ἐπίλοιποι τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτων.*

[2] Cf. on vv. 5, 6.

fixed upon externalities. Though it is impossible that John could have apprehended the woman as Mary herself, yet the fact was most closely present to his consciousness that this Mary, whose bodily offspring Christ was, was the final concentration of the O. T. theocracy." Gebhardt: "The Church of God is represented by the figure of a woman in the O. T. (Isa. liv. 1, 13, lxvi. 8; Mic. v. 1–3). The question now arises, whether we are here to understand the Church of the O. T. or of the N. T. From the first verse of the chapter to the last, the woman, without doubt, represents the same personality, and the seer cannot have understood, by the woman, the N. T. Church, in distinction from that of the O. T.: the general statements of vv. 1–6 are against it, nor is this interpretation helped by limiting the meaning of the Jewish Christian Church. On the other hand, it is utterly impossible to understand by the woman, the O. T. Church in distinction from that of the New; for then not only vv. 13–17, but even ver. 6, would be without meaning. What, then, are we to understand by the woman? Simply, the Church of God which already existed in the prophetic fact of the old covenant, and which now exists in the time of its fulfilment in Christendom, and will exist in its eternal completion in the new heaven and the new earth." Beck: "The woman clothed with the sun designates the heavenly kingdom of God, as it unites in itself as the true Church the O. and the N. T. Church of God as a divine Church-kingdom, in contrast with the adulterous church of the flesh. Already in the O. T. covenant of promise and its believers, this divine Church-kingdom had found its *external* type and *external* preparation; but in the N. T. spiritual institution, with its spiritual gifts and spiritual men, it had found its *inner* type and *inner* preparation: finally, in the future new Church of the new earth, it has both its *external* and *inner* completion." On the particular features, Gerhard (*L. T.*, xi. 34): "Clothed with the sun" = the righteousness assumed by faith, Mal. iv. 2, and the heavenly glory in which it shall shine hereafter, Matt. xiii. 43. "The moon under her feet" = treading upon all the mutations of earth, and especially heresies which, like the moon, are ever changing. "Crown of twelve stars" = brilliancy of prophetic and apostolic doctrine. "Being in travail" = pains of spiritual birth (Gal. iv. 19, etc.). Beck regards the sun, as signifying not only the benign influence of the Church in diffusing light and life, but also the glory of the new Jerusalem; while in treading upon the moon, which derives its light from the sun, and is the earthly measure of time and the variable light of the earthly night, he finds portrayed the superiority of the Church above all earthly times and changes, and its eternal lustre uninterrupted by night (xxii. 5; Isa. lx. 20). So Luthardt: "She triumphs over night, which for her has passed away." On "in travail," see Victorinus: "The ancient Church of the fathers and prophets and saints and apostles, which had the groans of its torments and longings, until it saw that Christ had taken flesh." Luther, in 1535, expressed the conception of this passage as referring to the Church in its entire chronological compass, in his hymn, *Sie ist mir lieb, der werthe Magd.* The two last stanzas have been thus rendered by Massie:—

"She wears a crown of purest gold,
Twelve shining stars attend her;
Her raiment, glorious to behold,
Surpasses far in splendor
The sun at noon;
Upon the moon
She stands, the Bride
Of Him who died:

Sore travail is upon her;
She bringeth forth a noble Son,
Whom all the world doth honor;
She bows before His throne.

"Thereat the dragon raged, and stood
With open mouth before her;
But vain was his attempt, for God
His buckler broad threw o'er her.
Up to his throne
He caught his Son,
But left the foe
To rage below.
The mother, sore afflicted,
Alone into the desert fled;
There by her God protected,
By her true Father fed."

[See also below, Note LXIX.]

LXVIII. (*b.*) Ver. 7. *πόλεμος ἐν οὐρανῷ.*

Philippi (*Kirch. Glaubenslehre*, III. 321 sq.): "In the N. T. there seem to be contradictory expressions. For while, according to Rev. xii. 7 sqq., Satan still dwells in heaven, according to Luke x. 18 he has already fallen from heaven like lightning; and while, according to Eph. ii. 2, the power of the prince of darkness prevails in the air, according to 2 Pet. ii. 4 God has cast the fallen angels into the abyss, and delivered them unto chains of darkness as those who are to be kept for judgment, and in Jude, ver. 6, they are reserved in everlasting chains under darkness for the judgment of the great day. On the other hand, they pray (Luke viii. 31; cf. Matt. viii. 29, 31) not to be cast into the abyss before the time, as also, according to Matt. xxv. 41, Rev. xx. 10, only at the final judgment shall they be handed over to eternal fire with its pain. The seeming contradiction of these different forms of statement is explained only by the distinction between the literal and the figurative modes of expression. The dwelling in heaven as the superterrestrial region is a figure, partly of qualification for superterrestrial exercise of power, partly of participation in superterrestrial, blessed life. Since Satan employs the former, even until the day of judgment, he is still up to that time in heaven; but when Christ, as the stronger, came upon him, and despoiled him of his power (Matt. xii. 29), he saw him, like lightning, fall from heaven. . . . As long as the kingdom of Satan continues among unbelievers on earth, and his power to tempt believers remains, so also does he still continue to be in heaven; and not until the *parousia* of the Lord shall he be cast out, and divested of his own power. But, on the other hand, in so far as Satan, with his angels, is excluded from the communion of the superterrestrial blessed life of God, is he from the very beginning at the moment of his fall, no longer in heaven, but in the abyss."

LXIX. Ver. 17. *μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν.*

Alford: "Note, as important elements for the interpretation: 1. That the woman has seed besides the man-child who was caught up to God's throne, those who are not only distinct from herself, but who do not accompany her in her flight into the wilderness. 2. That those persons are described as being they who

keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus. 3. That during the woman's time of her being fed in the wilderness, the dragon is making war, not against her, but against this remnant of her seed. 4. That by the form of expression here, — these present participles, descriptive of habit, and occurring at the breaking-off of the vision, as regards the general description of the dragon's agency, — it is almost necessarily implied that the woman, while hidden in the wilderness from the dragon's wrath, goes on bringing forth sons and daughters thus described." These facts he regards fatal to the view of the flight as the withdrawal of God's true servants from open recognition. So Beck, who also finds its solution in the doctrine of the invisible Church, and refers to the parallel in Gal. iv. 27. In fact, the entire passage (Gal. iv. 22 sqq.) affords an answer to an objection which Düsterdieck derives from the *οἱ λοιποὶ*; for here, as there, the Church, as an institution regenerating and perpetuating through the word and sacraments a spiritual seed, is a mother; while the individuals belonging to the Church, as the congregation of believers, are the children. Our author ignores the well-known principle, *Omne simile claudicat.*

CHAPTER XIII.

Ch. xii. ver. 18. *ἐστάθη.* So Treg., Lach. [W. and H.], also Hofm. (Weiss. u. Erf. II. 354), after the best witnesses (A, C, ℵ, 92, Vulg., Syr., Ar., Aeth., Ed., Ald.), indorsed already by Mill (*Proleg.*, 1249). The Recepta *ἐστάθην* (B., Copt., al., Griesb., Matth., Tisch., Ewald, De Wette, etc.) is, most probably, an accommodation to the succeeding *καὶ εἶδον.* Cf. the exposition.

Ch. xiii. ver. 1. *κέρατα δέκα καὶ κεφαλὰς ἑπτὰ.* So, properly already, Griesb. The reverse order (Elz.), as xii. 3, appears more natural. — *ὄνομα βλασφημίας.* The singular (Elz., Wetst., Beng.) sufficiently supported by C, ℵ, and other witnesses, which, besides, Andreas has in his text and commentary, is properly maintained by Züll. and De Wette. The strongly indorsed plural *ὀνόματα* (A, B, Verss., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]), received already by Griesb., is suspicious as an interpretation. — Ver. 5. Whether *καὶ βλασφημίας* (C, ℵ, Elz., Tisch. IX. [W. and H.]), or *κ. βλασφημίαν* (B, al., Beng., Tisch.), or, finally, *κ. βλάσφημα* (A, Lach.), is to be written, is not to be decided from the witnesses contradicting one another. The reading *βλάσφημα* does not commend itself, because of its conformity with the preceding *μεγάλα.* The sing. might merit preference to the plur. (cf. ver. 6, where *εἰς βλασφημίας* is correctly read, Lach., Tisch.), as a less easy reading. — Ver. 7. The first member of the verse, *καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ πόλεμον ποιῆσαι* (Elz., Beng., Griesb.; *ποιῆσαι πόλεμον*, ℵ, Tisch.) *μετὰ τῶν ἁγίων καὶ νικῆσαι αὐτούς*, is lacking in important witnesses (A, C, 12, 14, 92), and is erased by Lach. But the words which occur in B, ℵ, Verss., and whose erroneous omission is easily explained, because the second half of the verse also begins with *καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ*, are retained with greater propriety by Tisch. — Ver. 8. Instead of the Rec. *ὧν οὐ γέγραπται τὰ ὀνόματα ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ τ. ζ.*, it is undoubtedly more correct to read: *τὸ ὄνομα* (A, B, C, al.) and *ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τ. ζ.* (Beng., Griesb., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]). But the rest of the words also are, with Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.], to be changed to *οὐ οὐ γέγρ. τὸ ὄνομα αὐτου ἐν τ. β. τ. ζ.* The *οὐ* occurs in C, Iren.; the *αὐτου* in A, C. Also the particularly erroneous reading *οὐαὶ*, which A has written before *γέγρ.*, appears to point back to the reading *οὐ οὐ γέγρ.* ℵ appears uncertain. — The *τοῦ* before *ἐσφαγμ.*, which is lacking in the Rec., is properly (A, B, C, ℵ) restored by Beng., Griesb., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]. — Ver. 10. The Rec., *εἴ τις αἰχμαλωσίαν συνάγει, εἰς ἀιχμαλωσίαν ὑπάγει*, which in this form is almost without support, expresses most readily, and, for this reason, in a suspicious way, the meaning which numerous variations in many ways describe ("If any one shall have led captivity, he shall go into captivity" (Iren.). *εἴ τις αἰχμαλωτίζει, εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν ὑπάγει.* 7. *αἰχμαλωτιεῖ, αἰχμαλωτισθήσεται*, 18), and which A gives thus: *εἴ τις εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν, εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν ὑπάγει* (Lach., large ed., Tisch. [W. and H.]). To this last reading the defective form of the text also points, which occurs in B, C, ℵ, 28, 38: *εἴ τις εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν ὑπάγει*, for this is manifestly only a mistake which has once omitted the twice-written words *εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν.* The corrupt reading in Andr., *εἴ τις ἔχει αἰχμαλωσίαν, ὑπάγει*, is manifestly only the remnant of an interpretation. According to

the witnesses, therefore, the text given by Lach. and Tisch. is the best. But it is not improbable (cf. De Wette) that the *ὑπάγει* also is an interpretation; for the entire sentence, elliptical also in the second clause, would read: *εἴ τις εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν, εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν.* — Ver. 12. *καὶ ποιεῖ τ. γ.* The pres. (A, C, ℵ, Elz., Lach., Tisch. IX. [W. and H.]), which is certain in ver. 12*a* and ver. 13, would be unchanged not only in the imperf. (B, Tisch.), but also in the fut. (cf. Griesb., Tisch.). — Ver. 14. Instead of the neuter *ὃ ἔχ.* (ℵ), the extremely remarkable masc. *ὃς* occurs not only in A, 28, 33 (Griesb.), but also (cf. Tisch.) in B, C. Lach. and Tisch. [W. and H.] have, therefore, written *ὃς*. But since the writer of the Apoc. could have written the masc. neither by a grammatical error (cf. vv. 2, 11), nor possibly because of the reference to a masc. subject, which would be represented by the *θηρίον* (against Hofm., *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 635; Volkmar. See exposition), the grammatically correct form is to be maintained, although the appearance of the *ὃς* in the most important MSS. is inexplicable. Perhaps the masc. (cf. xvii. 16; also xiv. 1, var. lect.) is an attempt at interpretation in the sense of Volkmar. But the interpretation thus indicated is refuted by the context. The reference also to *ὁ δράκων* (cf. ver. 8) is here impossible. The neut. necessary for correct exegesis has in its favor also the critical authority of ℵ. — Ver. 15. The *ἵνα*, which must be expected with *ἀποκτανθῶσιν* after the *ποίησῃ*, occurs in A (Lach.) before *ὅσοι*, in minusc. directly before *ἀποκτ.* (Elz.). That the particle is missing in B, ℵ (so also Tisch.), is occasioned indeed by the uncertainty of the passage. — Ver. 17. A, B, ℵ$_1$, Vulg., al., favor the *καὶ* at the beginning of the verse. The omission (C, Lach., Tisch. IX.) is easily explained, since, as the catena (in Tisch.) expressly says, it is regarded as superfluous.

After the dragon, in order to inflict his wrath upon believers (xii. 17), has come to the seashore (ver. 18), John sees a beast rise out of the sea, which, like the dragon himself (xii. 3), is furnished with ten horns, seven heads, and ten diadems, and already by these insignia immediately makes known that it is an instrument to be employed by him in his war (xii. 17). To this beast the dragon also gives great power and dominion (xiii. 2), and it is permitted to make war against the saints (ver. 7); yet the description of this mighty instrument in the hand of Satan does not remain without the definite encouragement of sure consolation (ver. 10). — Besides the first beast, still another, which rises from the earth, is presented to the eye of the seer (ver. 11 sqq.). This second beast appears, not as co-ordinate with the first, which is absolutely *the* beast (vv. 14, 15, 17, 18), but[1] subordinate to it, an accomplice by means of seductive speeches, and other means of deception, to promote the activity of the first beast, and thus, likewise, to serve the wrath of the dragon.

Ch. xii. ver. 18. *καὶ ἐστάθη.* The reading of the Rec. *κ. ἐστάθην*, in a documentary respect decidedly inferior to *κ. ἐστάθη*, is not utterly impossible in an exegetical respect, as De Wette says;[2] for there is no contradiction between the *ἐστάθη* and the *ἀπῆλθε πολεμῆσαι* (xii. 17), but in ver. 18 it is directly described how the dragon, who (ver. 17) turns from the fruitless persecution

[1] Cf. Hengstenb.

[2] Cf. also Vitr., Beng., Züll., Ewald, Bleek, Hengstenb., and Auberlen, all of whom expressly speak in favor of the Rec.

of the woman to begin a conflict with believers, now stations himself on the seashore, viz., by no means as a spectator,[1] but with the purpose to call forth the beast from the sea, and to equip him with his power (ver. 2), which he will use as his instrument in the conflict he has now undertaken against believers.[2] Against Ebrard, who objects: "Is John to have the dragon standing by the sea, and, besides, see his incarnation rise from the sea? What the dragon commits to the *θηρίον* are not possessions which he could have transmitted to him visibly. The dragon also no longer comes before us; it is not known whither he has gone," — it is especially to be considered, that in ver. 2 the dragon appears on the scene actually and visibly to John, communicates his power, etc., to the *θηρίον*, and that this is in no way an "incarnation" of Satan, in the sense that he himself could not appear with the beast. Hence, between the *ἀπῆλθε πολεμῆσαι*, κ.τ.λ., xii. 17, and the *ἐδόθκεν*, κ.τ.λ., xiii. 2, something must interpose, which explains that the *ἀπῆλθε* does not declare a complete retirement from the scene of the vision. This interposition is given with exquisite appropriateness by the *καὶ ἐστάθη*, κ.τ.λ., ver. 18. — *ἐπὶ τὴν ἄμμον τῆς θαλ.*, because the beast is to come *ἐκ τῆς θαλάσσης* (xiii. 1).

Ch. xiii. ver. 1. The following hints may serve for the preliminary fixing of points amidst the complication of expositions of the details and of the whole, that cross one another: —

1. The *interpretation* of the beast upon the sea, vv. 1-10, — which appears also in ver. 11-18 as the chief beast, and whose correct interpretation is, therefore, the chief question, — is attempted in a twofold way, as in the beast there is, or is not, found a symbol of the Roman character (worldly dominion and power, the worship of idols, and superstition, etc.). The two chief species of exposition have each, again, two particular forms, which are very distinct. While many expositors in their reference to Rome refer only to pagan Rome,[3] others have in mind Christian, i.e., papal, antichristian Rome.[4] On the other hand, however, many expositors also, who interpreted neither the entire form of the beast, nor all his individual features, as referring to Rome, yet have assumed a reference to papal Rome by regarding the beast,[5] as a whole, as pertaining to the description of the secular power, and have found the appearance of the secular power in the papacy symbolized, at least, by one part of the form of the beast, viz., by one of the seven heads;[6] while, especially by Catholic interpreters,[7] a mode of explanation is recommended, which regards the reference to Rome as distant as possible.

2. The exposition is *regulated*, on the one hand, by the symbol of Daniel; on the other, by the parallel descriptions in the Apoc. itself (ch. xii. 3 sqq.; ch. xvii.). But with what freedom and independence John both has, in ch.

[1] "Was the dragon the spectator, or was John?" Vitr. [2] Cf. Hofm.; also Volkm.

[3] Victorin., Beda, Alcas, Bossuet, Hammond, Grot., Wetst., Eichh., Herd., Ewald, De Wette, Lücke, Bleek.

[4] Coccej., Vitr., Luther, Calov, Bengel., and many others.

[5] A. Ch. Lämmert (*Babel, das Thier u. der falsche Prophet*, Gotha, 1863), depending on Auberlen, has wandered into arbitrary generalities.

[6] Hengstenb., Ebrard, Auberlen.

[7] C. a Lap., Stern; cf. also already Andr.

xiii., fashioned the features derived from the Danielian symbol into a new picture, and also in ch. xvii. again presented them differently from ch. xiii., must be shown by the explanation of the details, which has thus to seek a decision of the controversy of expositors.

ἐκ τῆς θαλάσσης. The ordinary exposition makes its work too easy by immediately allegorizing the rising of the beast from the sea: "The beast rose from the disordered life of this world which surges in an ungodly way, viz., from the sea of nations."[1] The proper representation of the visionary locality is so little respected by this, that even in the statement *ἐπὶ τ. ἄμμον τ. θαλ.*, xii. 18, a symbolical designation of numberless[2] masses of people has been found. But as, e.g., xii. 1, 3, the *οὐρανός*, in which the woman and the dragon appear to the seer, signifies nothing else in a symbolical way than the expression declares, so in this passage, especially, nothing further is represented than that the first beast rises out of the sea, on whose visible shore the dragon had just placed himself, while the second beast is beheld in the vision coming from the actual earth (ver. 11). But it is a further question as to whether a particular reference lies in this statement of place, which[3] follows not so much from the symbol of Dan. vii., and from Rev. xvii. 1, 5, as rather from the parallelism of ver. 11, where the *ἐκ τῆς γῆς* has in fact an inner relation (ver. 12). It results also, in general, from the mutual connection of the two beasts, and especially from the analogy of the *ἐκ τῆς γῆς*, that the *ἐκ τῆς θαλάσσης* must have a similar relation. De Wette, therefore, is already in error, when he conjoins the rising out of the sea, and the coming out of the abyss (xi. 7, xvii. 8), as though the beast were designated by the *ἐκ τ. θαλάσσης* as "a birth from the kingdom of darkness," or even as one (Nero) returning from the realm of death.[4] Ewald's opinion, also, that the *ἐκ τ. θαλ.* designates the *insular* government of the Roman beast,[5] is remote, and makes too much of an irrelevant point. — As the other beast rises from the earth, as from its own element and province, in order to corrupt the earth and those who dwell thereon, and to seduce to the worship of the first beast, so the first beast rises[6] out of the sea, which surrounds the whole earth, in order to rule over all who dwell within the boundaries of its sphere, — over the whole earth (ver. 4), and all that dwell on the earth (ver. 8), over all tribes and peoples (ver. 7). The sea, whereby the earth itself is surrounded, appears in like manner as a more remote province of the first beast rising from the same, as this beast himself properly rules, and the second beast only serves him. The two beasts appear throughout,

[1] Victorin., Beda, Andr., C. a Lap., Coccej., Boss., Stern, Hengstenb., Ebrard, Klief., etc.; cf. also Grot.: "From the power of the empire," so that "the public origin" of this beast is indicated in contrast with "the private origin" of the other. Beng.: "From Europe."

[2] Cf. xx. 8. Hengstenb.

[3] Against Hammond and Eichh., who find only some sort of visionary locality designated.

[4] Against De Wette (cf. also Volkm., Ew. ii.), it is asserted only that the expression *ἐκ τῆς θαλάσσης* does *not* give the idea of *ἐκ τῆς ἀβύσσου*. Independent of this is the opinion also defended by De Wette, that the beast from the abyss (xi. 7) is essentially identical with the beast from the sea (xiii. 7); for that the different turns in the representation rest upon essentially the same foundation, is shown in ch. xvii.

[5] "Transmarine Rome, or that situated on the island of Italy."

[6] *ἀναβαῖνον*, pres., as vii. 2.

not as two rulers by the side of one another, as if possibly to the first belonged only the sea without the earth, and to the second, on the other hand, the earth; but the power and dominion over the whole earth are given the first beast; while the second beast works on the earth and upon its inhabitants, only in the service of the first. This relation expresses itself also in the fact that the first beast comes forth from the sea itself surrounding the earth. The analogy of the contrasted ἐκ τ. γῆς (ver. 11) forbids us to regard the ἐκ τ. θαλάσσης as the sea of nations;[1] but this mode of exposition cannot be justified by an appeal to xvii. 1, 15, since there is no contrast in that passage between sea and earth; and, also, the sea is not once mentioned, but the ὑδατα πολλά, on which the harlot sits. The entire view there is thus different.

θηρίον — ἐχον κέρατα δέκα, κ.τ.λ. Hengstenb. properly emphasizes against Beng. the fact that the expression θηρίον has already in itself a bad secondary signification. The ζῶα[2] could not be called θηρία. Already, in Daniel,[3] the godless secular kingdoms appear in the forms of θηρία, and especially is the significant feature to be there[4] observed, that just as the self-sufficient scorn of the Chaldaean king is punished by his brutalization, so, on the other hand, because of his repentance there were given to the beast, representing the Chaldaean empire, human feet and a human heart. — The more definite explanation of the θηρίον is afforded by what follows.[5] — That John mentions first[6] the ten horns, then the seven heads of the beast, — otherwise than in the parallel xii. 3, — could have its foundation in the fact,[7] that at the rising of the beast the horns first became visible; but according to this consideration, it must be expected that then the further description, καὶ ἐπὶ τ. κεράτων αὐτ. δέκα διαδ., immediately connects with the κέρατα δέκα, and it would be written καὶ κεφαλὰς ἑπτὰ καὶ ἐπὶ τ. κεφ. αὐτ. ὀνομα βλασφ. As not only the order in which the ten horns and seven heads of the beast are mentioned, is different from that in the description of the dragon, who, nevertheless, in other respects bears essentially the same insignia, but the present description has in it something peculiar, in that here the ten diadems appear on the ten horns, while there (xii. 3) the seven diadems appear on the seven heads of the dragon; the entire order in the particular points of the description, which also expresses something particular with respect to the heads of the beast, depends upon a deeper foundation, lying especially in the significance of the form of the beast. If it is denied that the θηρίον designates the precise form of the antichristian secular power which this has attained in the Roman Empire,[8] the explanation of itself indicates arbitrary guessing: the ten horns and seven heads — which are generally interpreted in reverse order — may then be understood as representations of the seven periods of the world, and of a tenfold division of the government of the world;[9] of the seven kings before the appearance of antichrist;[10] of the seven secular powers, viz., the Egyptian, Assyrian, Chaldaean, Medo-Persian, Greek, Roman, and the final

[1] Hengstenb., Hofm., etc.
[2] iv. 6 sqq.
[3] vii. 1 sqq.
[4] vii. 4; cf. iv. 28 sqq.
[5] See, in general, on ver. 18.
[6] See Critical Notes.
[7] Beng., Hengstenb.
[8] See what follows, especially ver. 18.
[9] Andr.
[10] C. a Lap.

still future power with its ten divisions;[1] of the seven persecutions of Christians;[2] of the seven powers hostile to Christianity, corresponding to the seven periods of N. T. history, and of the seven small powers[3] combined with antichrist. But even the expositors who have referred the θηρίον to Rome have not always been able to give a definite and intelligible meaning to the particular features of the Apocalyptic image. This applies not only to those to whom the essential tendency of ch. xiii.[4] appears to pertain to the Papacy,[5] but also to those who properly abide by heathen Rome, as the form of the antichristian secular power contained within the horizon of the prophet. If, by a superficial comparison with xvii. 9, the seven heads of the beast are interpreted of the seven hills of Rome,[6] the explanation of the ten horns by "the ten servant kings"[7] is manifestly utterly out of place; Ewald also, who refers the seven to the Roman emperors, and the ten to the prefects of the provinces, ignores the inner connection and essential relationship which exists already, according to xii. 3, between the seven heads and the ten horns. — The θηρίον, i.e., the antichristian, Roman secular power, in the service of the dragon, at the same time bears both the ten horns and seven heads; after this is first declared, a further description (καὶ ἐπὶ τ. κερ., κ.τ.λ.) follows, which, on the one hand, is assigned to the ten horns as that mark of royal dominion which in xii. 3 appears on the seven heads of the dragon himself, and, on the other, so designates the heads that the blasphemous nature of the entire beast[8] is illustrated. Yet, while in the description of the dragon, xii. 3, not only are the seven heads mentioned before the ten horns, but diadems also ascribed to the heads, but not to the horns, we find in this passage the opposite in both respects; for the subject here treated has respect to a signification of the concrete form of the Roman Empire, as this is proved by facts. Thus there appear, first of all, ten actual rulers; ten persons who, as the actual possessors of the government, are symbolized by the ten horns, each furnished with a diadem: (1) Augustus, (2) Tiberius, (3) Caligula, (4) Claudius, (5) Nero, (6) Galba, (7) Otho, (8) Vitellius, (9) Vespasian, (10) Titus.[9] Yet the beast, like the dragon (xii. 3), has only seven heads, not as though one of these heads bore all ten horns, or the horns were distributed inequally among the various heads,[10] but seven heads bore each a coroneted horn, because, in seven of the persons of rulers mentioned, the actual full possession of the empire was found, while the three other coroneted horns are to be regarded rather between the two heads, — and that, too, corresponding with the actual state

[1] xvii. 12. Hengstenb., Ebrard, Auberlen.
[2] Alcas. [3] Stern.
[4] Cf. ch. xvii.
[5] Cf. Vitr., who designates as "the ordinary exposition of our writers" the view that the seven heads are seven rulers at Rome of diverse kinds, viz., kings, consuls, decemviri, military tribunes, dictators, emperors, popes; while the ten horns designate the ten kingdoms, which, according to xvii. 12, are still future to John, and are to serve the Pope, of France, Spain, Germany, England, Scotland, Denmark, Sweden, Hungary, Bohemia, Poland.
[6] Victorin., Hammond, Grot., etc.
[7] Hammond, Grot., etc.
[8] Cf. ver. 4.
[9] That the tenth, who corresponds to the seventh head, is still future, and that this one will have a successor who will actually be the last Roman ruler of the world, does not come *here* into discussion.
[10] See on xii. 3.

of affairs between the fifth and sixth head, — because these three horns represent those persons whose usurped power was not so much the true possession of the government, as rather a rebellion through which the government itself was in the highest degree endangered.[1] — *καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτοῦ ὄνομα βλασφημίας.* The sing. *ὄνομα*[2] is not to be understood as though there were upon each of the seven heads a letter of the blasphemous name, and accordingly the entire name was found upon the seven heads taken together, as Züll. thinks, since he ascribes golden frontlets to the heads, and, as the beast is the antithesis to the High-Priest, the Messiah, conjectures such an inscription as there was on the frontlet of the high-priest, viz., the designation קֹדֶשׁ לַיהוָה, consisting of seven letters. But there is no need of such superficial determinations; the sing. is meant distributively,[3] i.e., a name is to be regarded as on each of the seven heads, and that is always the same name of blasphemy, so that thus all the concrete embodiments of the Roman Empire, signified by the heads of the beast, appear as of the same blasphemous nature, as in xvii. 3, also, the entire beast, symbolizing the Roman world-dominion, appears full of the names of blasphemy. But how the name of blasphemy stands on the seven heads, is neither to be asked nor to be answered. Bengel, in the sense of many expositors, calls the name "The Pope." Hengstenb. improperly combines the names of blasphemy with the horns and crowns, as though one included the other, and thinks that the name belonging only to Christ (xix. 16) is usurped by the beast as a blasphemous designation of his world-dominion. But the context[4] affords only in general the idea that divine honor is ascribed in a blasphemous way to the beast, while a more definite name referring to this is not further expressed. Serving for the explanation of the subject, in this sense, is the remark already of Beda, although he does not mention Rome: "For they call their kings gods, as well those that have died and been transferred, as it were, to heaven and the gods, as those also still on earth, by the name *Augusti*, which is, as they wish, the name of deity."[5] See Introduction, p. 00.[6] [Note LXX., p. 386.]

Ver. 2. That the description of the form of the beast has been developed from Dan. vii. 4 sqq., is at once manifest; but it must not be overlooked, that the Apocalyptic portrayal of it has an essentially distinct conception and purpose. Daniel portrays four worldly kingdoms succeeding one another (the Chaldaean, Medan, Persian, and Greek), and that, too, in such a way that the forms of beasts which symbolize the first three kingdoms are not only like a lion, a bear, and a leopard, but also bear within themselves other significative marks, while the fourth worldly kingdom is represented under the form of a monster, not specifically determined, as, on the one hand, by the great iron teeth, the power of this kingdom, devouring and crushing all, and on the other, however, by the ten horns, beneath which again a small horn comes forth corruptibly, it is symbolized how Antiochus

[1] Cf. ver. 3. Introduction, p. 48.
[2] See Critical Notes.
[3] De Wette; cf. Ewald, Hengstenb., etc.
[4] Cf. ver. 4.
[5] Cf. also Ewald, De Wette, Volkm., etc.
[6] Details of various kinds also in Wiedermeister, *Der Cäsarenwahnsinn*, Hannover, 1875, p. 106, etc.

Epiphanes finally rises as the blasphemous usurper of the Greek Empire ruled by the ten kings successively. John, however, describes not four or more, but in any case *one* kingdom; whether he have in mind the undivided idea of the world-power in general, which has attained form in many concrete empires, — from the Egyptian to the Roman of that time,[1] — or, without definite reference to the earlier empires, refer only to the present Roman. At all events, it is incorrect to mangle the undivided form of the beast, and to explain perhaps with Wetst., who inverts the order: "The mouth of the lion designates the greed and avarice of Galba; the form of the leopard, the inconsiderate rashness and inchastity of Otho; the feet of the bear, the ferocity and torpor of Vitellius." But it is no less incorrect when Andreas so interprets the combined form of the beast that he refers the leopard, etc., to that definite kingdom which he understands by the beast in Dan. vii., but in connection therewith attempts to preserve the unity of the idea by considering the antichrist, the coming ruler of the Roman Empire, as possessor at the same time of those three kingdoms;[2] as it depends in general only upon an inaccurate combination with ch. xvii., when in this passage the beast from the sea is regarded the antichrist himself, or his kingdom, in the sense that not the present Roman empire, but one not to be expected until the end of days, is to be understood;[3] for the tendency of the entire statement of ch. xiii.[4] pertains not to the pure future, as though an antichristian efficacy of Satan and the worldly power in his service, as it will have place only at the end of days, were to be described, but the world-power already present, ruling over all in blasphemous pride and oppressing believers,[5] appears here in a way that undoubtedly makes us recognize its antichristian nature as to how it stands in the service of Satan himself. This antichristian world-power, — and that, too, in the definite appearance of the present Roman Empire, — John beholds in a form of a beast, whose threefold composition of the leopard, bear, and lion is to be explained as little in the sense of Dan. vii., as the ten horns of ver. 1 are to be combined with the fourth beast, which in Daniel bears this number of horns.[6] Just as the ten coroneted horns (and the seven heads) serve only to designate a particular individuality of the Roman Empire symbolized by the entire form of beast, entirely apart from the fact that in Daniel a fourth empire is symbolized by a monstrous beast with ten horns, so also the combination of the Apocalyptic beast does not have the sense that, in the empire signified by this beast, either the definite empire[7] of Daniel, or all empires in general, inclusive of the present Roman and the still future,[8] i.e., the Germano-Slavic,[9] appear combined, and accordingly the beast out of the sea signifies the world-power only abstractly;[10] but, on the contrary, the form of a beast which is compared as a whole to the leopard, which is as rapid in its move-

[1] Hengstenb., etc.

[2] πάρδ. designates the Greek, ἄρκ. the Persian, λέ. the Babylonian empire: ὃν κρατησει ὁ Ἀντίχριστος ὡς Ῥωμαίων βασιλεὺς ἐλευσόμενος.

[3] Against C. a Lap., Hofm., etc.

[4] Cf. already ch. xii.

[5] Which John, of course, considers to be such as is immediately judged and brought to naught by the coming of the Lord.

[6] Against Züll., De Wette.

[7] Andr., etc. [8] Hengstenb.

[9] Auberlen.

[10] "The ungodly world-power as a whole."

ments as it is strong,[1] is furnished with feet like the paws of a bear,[2] while its mouth is like the jaws of a lion, so that thus the entire monstrous beast, which unites in itself the most dreadful weapons of the strongest beasts, informs us of the rapacity and power of the Roman Empire displayed in the same. The special interpretation of particular features reaches too far, and is, therefore, arbitrary, as in Beda: *πάρδ.*, "on account of the variety of nations;"[3] *ἄρκ.*, "on account of spite and madness;" *λέ.*, "on account of bravery of body and pride of tongue."

καὶ ἔδωκεν, κ.τ.λ. Here is shown the reason why the dragon, who in xii. 17 has entered into a conflict against believers, has come upon the shore of the sea (xii. 18): he has called the beast from the sea in order to equip him with his own power, and thus to make him an instrument of his wrath. In what way the dragon accomplished this impartation, *ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ*, we dare not ask, since John does not declare it, for properly he does not attempt to state what is not made visible. — Worthy of notice is the inner relation of the three points, *τὴν δύναμιν αὐτ., τ. θρόνον αὐτ.*, and *ἐξουσίαν μεγάλην*. The *δύναμις* imparted to the beast, which is expressly marked as diabolical (*δύν. αὐτοῦ*), is shown in his power over freedom and life (ver. 10), and the entire business of men (ver. 17). But the dragon also, by giving his throne to the beast, invests it with a *βασιλεία*, so that now a throne can be ascribed to the beast himself (xvi. 10): hence the more definite view of the worldly *dominion* of the beast is here presented. Finally, the *ἐξουσία μεγάλη*[4] designates the great, yet always definite and limited, plenitude of power, in order by the medium of that *δύναμις* to work within the entire sphere of nature and to serve the purpose of the dragon.

Ver. 3. *καὶ μίαν ἐκ τ. κεφ.* With the accus., an express *εἶδον* is, indeed, not placed,[5] but its idea results[6] from the connection, since the *εἶδον*, ver. 1, which is repeated besides in ver. 2, continues to be effective. — *ὡς ἐσφαγ.* The *ὡς* stands just as in v. 6, only that in this passage the circumstance which explains how that one head bore the marks of an actual mortal wound, and yet could be represented like the rest in all the vigor of life, is expressly designated: *καὶ ἡ πλ. τ. θαν. αὐτ. ἐθεραπεύθη.* — The more significant that is, which is said in ver. 3*a*., and the more this special feature of the entire image of the beast from the sea is adapted thereto, in order to adjust and test the correct interpretation of the whole, the more certain, on the other hand, to become helpless here, is every exposition that misunderstands the image of the beast as a whole. Hengstenb., Ebrard, Auberlen, etc., who regard the *θηρίον* an image of the world-power in general, infer from xvii. 10, with entire impropriety, that the head wounded unto death, and again healed, is the *sixth*, i.e., that whereby the Roman form of the world-power is symbolized. But although Hengstenb. further interprets that

[1] Cf. Jer. v. 6; Hos. xiii. 7; Sir. xxviii. 23, where, in order to illustrate dreadful strength, the leopard is compared with the lion and the wolf.

[2] *ὡς ἄρκ.* Cf. iv. 6, 8. Var. Lect. ix. 7–9.

[3] Cf. Grot.: "The leopard is an animal of various color; thus Roman idolatry had as its gods, males, females, the greatest, the least," etc. Coccejus: "Of various color. For to this beast belong Christians serving bishops, and yet constituting another source of faith, also Arians, Mussulmans, etc." Vitr., etc.

[4] Cf. vi. 8, ix. 3, x. 19.

[5] Against the false Rec.

[6] Cf. iv. 4.

"by Christ's atonement" a mortal wound is inflicted upon Roman worldly affairs and heathenism, — a wound which, therefore, could appear as again healed, because the outward condition of the Roman Empire still continued, as John himself must have felt this ungodly power in his banishment to Patmos, — Ebrard and Auberlen prefer an interpretation expressly rejected by Hengstenb. They observe, that by the migration of nations the mortal wound was given the Roman Empire; but that this wound was healed, because a new "Roman Empire" had arisen, whose chief strength rests just in the Germanic nations. This Holy Roman Empire, however, appears as the sixth head of the beast, healed of its mortal wound, because its Christianity is secularized, ay, in all Christian appearance, often of a directly anti-christian activity; viz., in the Papacy. But the Christian aspect of this form of the world-power is positively expressed in the fact that the head of the beast (*ὡς ἐσφαγμ.*) bears in itself a certain resemblance to the Lamb (*ὡς ἐσφαγμ.*, v. 6). The mode of exposition thus reverts in essentials to the old Protestant; only that this was the more correct, so far as it did not acknowledge the vague significance of the *θηρίον* of the world-power in the abstract, but understood it as a definite reference to Rome. Thus Calov., in dependence on Luther, explains "'the beast wounded,' most correctly, of the Roman Empire, harassed by the invasions of the barbarians, who for more than three centuries wounded, devastated, and held Rome, so that, during that whole time, there was no Western emperor. It was also healed by the medical aid of Charlemagne and Leo III." Coccejus understood the head as the Grecian part of the Roman Empire: "In this part the beast received a fatal wound when Julian restored the worship of the gods." The *ἐθεραπεύθη* is interpreted: "Julian was removed, and Jovian, the Catholic, succeeded him." Phil. Nicolai referred the wounding to the dominion of seven hundred years by the Moors in Spain; the healing, to the expulsion of the enemy by King Ferdinand. Most consistently Vitringa explains that the mortal wound is the humiliation of Pope Alexander III. by the Emperor Frederick in the year 1160, and that the healing is the humiliation of the Emperor by the Pope in the year 1177:[1] on the other hand, Bengel, with his far-reaching interpretation,[2] stands already nearer the moderns, as Ebrard and Auberlen. But the former, as well as the latter, interpretation is rejected both by the connection of ch. xii.[3] and by the particular points in xiii. 1, 2 The *θηρίον* is just as certainly not the abstract world-power, as the seven heads are not particular "phases of the world-power," but kings, and that, too, Roman kings. Besides this, the *quid pro quo* which is ascribed to the writer of the Apocalypse, by representing him as describing the Holy Roman Empire as the empire of

[1] As a new interpretation, Vitr. proposes. "The first five fallen (xvii. 10) heads are five distinguished popes before the Reformation: Gregory VII., Alexander III., Innocent III., Boniface VIII., John XXII.; after the Reformation follow Paul III., Paul VIII., and finally the eighth, still future Pope, who shall put to death Christ's witnesses" (xi. 7).

[2] "You may see the paroxysms both of wounding and healing in the history of Gregory VII., Paschal II., Calist II., Alexander III., and others. Whatever adversity then happened is wounding; and whatever prosperity, healing."

[3] Auberlen has, indeed, found the migration of nations in xii. 15 sqq.

heathen Rome which has been again revived, is compatible neither with historical truth nor with a sound conception of biblical prophecy. In both respects, it is impossible to regard an historical development, which is dependent upon the Christian element, and which — in all its unchristian and antichristian deterioration — yet remains in its entire course Christian, and has produced truly holy fruit, as a head of this beast of the dragon. The only indication in the text, which apparently supports such a misconception, Auberlen, etc., have found in the expression ὡς ἐσφαγμ., as, from the comparison of v. 6, they have inferred that thereby there is ascribed to the healed head a Christian, i.e., an apparently Christian, life and nature. But supposing, what does not necessarily lie in the expression, that a significant contrast were intended between the Lamb standing there as slain, and the head of the beast wounded, as it were, to death: is it, then, not much more correct to explain, as Victorin. already has done,[1] viz., that the person represented by the head wounded and again healed is to be regarded as a pretended Christ in whom the sufferings and resurrection of the Lord appear to be imitated?

If we turn from such explanations as do not need a special refutation,[2] that of Victorin. is first presented, which, being brought again to notice by Corrodi[3] and Eichhorn, has been of late resolutely defended by Lücke, De Wette, Bleek, Baur, Volkmar, Hilgenf., E. Renan, etc[4] The Roman historians of the report bruited shortly after Nero's death, that he was still living, and would again appear,[5] are quoted. This opinion, which was current especially in Asia,[6] is recognized by the writer of the Apoc.; and two circumstances concur, which seem to greatly urge the explanation from that fancy of the enigmatical discourse concerning the head of the beast wounded to death, and again healed. On the one hand, it has penetrated Christian literature, viz., the Apocalyptic:[7] on the other hand, it appears to give a

[1] "This one, therefore, viz., Nero, being raised, God will send as a king worthy of the worthy, and a Messiah such as the Jews have merited." Cf. Beda: "Antichrist, pertaining to the heads of the earthly kingdom, *in imitation of our true* Head, professes *to have risen again, as though having been slain*, and presents himself for men's reception, instead of Christ, who truly did this." In like manner, Zeger, C. a Lap., etc.

[2] Grot. on ὡς ἐσφ.: "The Capitol was burned while the Vitellians and Flavians warred with one another."—ἐθεραπ.: "For the same Vespasian restored the Capitol, who also restored the Roman Empire, and, indeed, with great pomp of idolatry." Züllig, who in ver. 18 finds the name of Balaam: "Balaam, slain as anti-Moses, now has returned to life, with seven heads, as the anti-Messiah, as the one for whom he will now be regarded returned from death to life."

[3] *Krit. Gesch. des Chiliasmus*, Zür., vol. ii., p. 303 sqq.

[4] *Der Antichrist*, Germ. ed., Leipz. and Paris, 1873, p. 278.

[5] Tacit., *Hist.*, ii. 8: "About the same time, Achaia and Asia were terrified by a false rumor, as though Nero were approaching, and a fluctuating rumor concerning his death, the majority, on this account, thinking and believing that he was alive." Cf. Sueton., *Nero*, c. 57; Dio Chrys., *Or.*, xxi., ed. Reiske., T. I., p. 504.

[6] So that a false Nero, who availed himself of this in a remarkable way, found a following among the Parthians. Sueton., l. c.; Tacit., *Hist.*, i. 2: "War also with the Parthians, near at hand, was stirred up by the farce of the pretended Nero."

[7] *Sibyll. Orac.*, ed. Serv. Gall., L. VIII., p. 688: ὅταν γ' ἐπανέλθῃ ἐκ περάτων γαίης ὁ φυγὰς μητροκτόνος ἐλθών ["When the matricide fugitive returns from the opposite part of the earth"]. Cf. p. 716; L. V., p. 547; Sulp. Sev., *Hist.*, s., L. II., Opp. ed.; G. Hom., *Lugd. Bat.*, 1647, p. 373: "Certainly his body, viz., that of Nero, was slain; whence it is believed,

definite explanation of xvii. 8, and the one best harmonizing with ver. 3, viz., that Nero, slain by his own hand, appears returning from the abyss of hell, and working again as the living antichrist. — But against this mode of exposition it is to be remarked: (1) The writer of the Apocalypse in no way betrays such impurity and limitation of faith and Christian culture, that without injustice a superstition dare be ascribed to him which the Roman authors already had derided.[1] In any case, if John subscribed to that illusion, nothing more could any longer be said concerning a truly prophetical character of the Apoc., dependent upon inspiration, and concerning its canonical authority.[2] (2) In reference to xvii. 8,[3] it must be mentioned already here, how difficult it is by the θηρίον which is there described, to understand Nero alone, who is symbolized, just as in ch. xiii., by one of the seven heads of the beast. (3) But it is also in the highest degree doubtful whether the Nero-myth were current already at the close of the first century, as they try to find it in John: on the contrary, unmistakable traces indicate that the original Nero-myth received the form in which it is now by an anachronism, regarded as utilized in the Apoc. only by combining with it misunderstood passages like Rev. xiii. 3, xvii. 8, and 2 Thess. ii. 3 sqq. Sueton., Tacit., and Dio Chryst. by no means say that it was their opinion that the actually dead Nero had returned from the lower regions to life; but they report[4] that it was not properly known in what way Nero had died, and that, therefore,[5] the report originated that he was not at all dead, but had escaped to the Parthians, and would return to take vengeance on his enemies. So it stands in the sibylline books, where Nero appears as a fugitive,[6] who is to return from the ends of the earth, his temporary place of refuge.[7] That this Nero-myth was diffused among Christians by the authority of the sibylline books, is attested by Lactantius, who

that, although he pierced himself with the sword, yet that he was restored by the healing of his wound, as it is written of him: And the stroke of his death was healed, in order that he might be sent at the end of the world to exercise the mystery of iniquity."

[1] Dio Chryst., l. c.: τρόπον τινὰ οὐχ ἅπαξ αὐτοῦ τεθνηκότος, ἀλλὰ πολλάκις μετὰ τῶν σφόδρα οἰηθέντων αὐτον ζῆν.

[2] This statement is not based on a narrow-minded conception of the canon (Volkm.), but asserts the demands which justice and cautious piety make of exegetes. The Apoc., with respect to its other contents, stands so high that it is utterly impossible that it should advance any superstitious statement directly contradictory to the simplest Christian faith and thought (also against Weiss., p. 34). But if it be exegetically proved that this is nevertheless the case, it appears necessary to surrender the deutero-canonical authority of the book. But, in spite of all its dazzling appearance, the exegesis of Volkm., as well as of Ewald, etc., is on this point incorrect.

[3] See on the passage.

[4] Cf. especially Dio Chryst., l. c.: καὶ οὕτως ἀπέστησαν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἠνάγκασαν ὅτῳ ποτὲ τρόπῳ ἀπολέσθαι αὐτόν· οὐδέπω γὰρ καὶ νῦν τοῦτό γε δῆλόν ἐστιν ["And thus they stood aloof from him, and urged the question in what way he had died; for this even now was not as yet manifest"].

[5] Cf. Tacit., l. c.

[6] φυγάς, L. VIII., ver. 71; ed. Friedlieb, φεύγων, L. V., ver. 364.

[7] In the same sense also is the passage, L. V., ver. 33, to be understood. ἔσται καὶ ἄϊστος ὀλοίϊος, εἶτ' ἀνακάμψει, where Gallaeus ("will utterly be destroyed") and Friedlieb ("the pernicious vanishes away") mistranslate the ἄϊστος. It is said only that the pernicious one, i.e., Nero, will become invisible, viz., by flight, but will return. It is altogether a perversion when the sibylline expressions concerning the return of Nero are compared with the Apoc., in order to make a *Nero redivivus* acceptable here; for in the sibylline books the chief matter is lacking, as, e.g., Hilgenf. himself acknowledges (*Zeitschr. f. Wiss. Th.*, 1871, p. 39. Cf. also, 1869, p. 421 sqq.).

explains it not only as madness, but also indicates its natural origin:[1] "Cast down, therefore, from the head of the government, and fallen from its summit, the impotent tyrant suddenly was nowhere present, so that a place not even of burial might appear on earth for so wicked a beast. Whence some *madmen* believe that he has been translated and reserved alive, the sibyl saying that the fugitive matricide shall come from the ends of the earth," etc. Therefore Lactantius also knows nothing, as yet, of a resurrection and return of the dead Nero, but he has in view the faith of some madmen, supported by the sibylline books, that the still living Nero had found a refuge somewhere at the ends of the earth, whence he will return as a precursor of the antichrist.[2] But this superstition, still diffused at his time, Lact. regards so senseless, because thereby a life a century long must be presupposed to Nero; while the entire fable could be explained without difficulty, from the fact that the grave of Nero was unknown, — an explanation which is proved to be right, inasmuch as Nero was actually buried with the greatest silence.[3] In Lactantius, therefore, the Nero-myth, designated as senseless, does not have the form in which they want to find it presented by the writer of the Apoc. — Augustine is the first to testify to the existence of the expectation that Nero would arise from the dead, and return as antichrist, since he expressly remarks that this form of the myth, by the side of the older, has resulted from an interpretation of 2 Thess. ii. 3 sqq. that is as bold as it is perverted:[4] "Some think that this[5] was said of the Roman Empire, — as his declaration, 'The mystery of iniquity doth already work,' he wanted to be understood of Nero, whose deeds seemed as though of antichrist. *Whence some suspect that he will rise again, and be the antichrist.* But others think that he was not slain, but rather had withdrawn so as to be regarded slain, and was concealed alive in the vigor of the age, in which he was when he was believed to have died, until he would be revealed at his own time, and be restored to the government. But to me such presumption of those thinking these things is very wonderful." In this connection, also, Augustine does not mention the Apoc.[6] This is done by Sulp. Severus,[7] who, however, does not combine the myth of the revivification of the dead Nero with Apoc. xiii. 3, but under the presumption that Nero had actually committed suicide[8] records the entirely peculiar turn to the matter: It is believed that the wound which Nero inflicted upon himself was healed, and that he still lives, and at the end of the world will return as antichrist. The complete form of the myth is given first by Victorin., who expressly says that the actually deceased Nero would be again raised by God, and be sent as the pseudo-Messiah for judgment upon the ungodly; but Victorin.'s own words[9] betray the

[1] *De Mort. Persec.*, c. 2.

[2] "A precursor of the devil, and going before him as he comes to devastate the earth, and overthrow the human race."

[3] Eutrop., *Hist. Rom.* vii. 18: "The remains of Nero, which were buried in a humble way."

[4] *De Civ. D.*, L. XX., c. 19, § 3.

[5] l. c., ver. 7.

[6] That Nero had sometimes been regarded the antichrist of Daniel, because of his persecution of the Christians (Jerome on Dan. xi. 23: "Whence many of our writers think that because of the greatness of his cruelty and baseness, the Domitian Nero would be antichrist"), does not belong here.

[7] l. c.

[8] *Etiamsi se gladis transfixit.*

[9] *Nunc ergo caetera.*

origin of the myth thus fashioned, in the same way as Augustine[1] testifies to the origin of another application of the myth from 2 Thess. ii. It cannot, therefore, in any way be asserted upon an historical basis, that the writer of the Apocalypse, when he represents one of the heads of the beast as wounded to death and again healed, depends upon an idea current at his time, concerning the return of Nero raised from the dead, — for such an idea does not belong as yet to his time, — but it must be asserted that the writer of the Apoc. has himself fashioned this manner of expressing the Nero-myth. No one, however, has ventured this.

Any other explanation of ver. 3 is therefore hardly possible, than that indicated already in the Introduction.[2] By a combination with xvii. 8–11, the result is attained that the mortal wound cannot be referred to the sixth,[3] but must be referred to the fifth, head of the beast. This is correctly acknowledged by Ewald, Lücke, De Wette, etc., as they are further right in accounting Nero as the last of the fallen kings. But to proceed from this to the interpretation of xiii. 3, advocated by Ewald, Lücke, etc., — which is proved to be just as untenable, — is not only not demanded by xvii. 8–11, but is prohibited, because it is not said there that the fifth fallen king, i.e., Nero, would return as the eighth, but that the future eighth would be the personified beast himself. But of this nothing whatever is said in ch. xiii.; it is not once to be perceived from ch. xiii. that an eighth king is at all to be expected, so that *this* point (xvii. 11) is not in any way to be introduced into xiii. 3. The healing of the mortal wound certainly cannot, therefore, refer to one of the heads of the beast (the fifth), as it is neither said in ch. xvii., nor agrees with the statement in xiii. 3, that the fifth fallen (deceased) king will return as the eighth. On the contrary, the healing of the mortal wound on the fifth head of the beast must correspond to that which is stated in ch. xvii., so that the beast is not, and yet is; viz., it is in so far as the sixth king is. The existence of the sixth king is the healing of the mortal wound on the fifth head, whose infliction caused the beast not to be, and whose healing again caused the beast, nevertheless, to be. Thus ch. xvii. gives the riddle, and ch. xiii. 3 the clew whereby the riddle is solved. The mortal wound is inflicted upon the (fifth) head of the beast, and the interregnum immediately succeeding. It is to be observed, that it is not at all said that the coroneted horn on the (fifth) head was stricken off, and grew again, — this would attach the idea expressly to the person of Nero, and correspond with the opinion of Ewald, Lücke, De Wette, and Volkm., — but that, in accordance with the distinction between the heads and the horns (cf. ver. 1), the idea of the Roman Empire, so far as it was under the Emperor Nero, is expressed[4] This empire, designated by the fifth head of the beast, received a mortal wound when Nero, the bearer of the empire, and the last of the race of the Caesars which had founded the empire, committed suicide, and that, too, under the compulsion of the rebellion of a usurper (Galba), who, as little as his two successors (Otho, Vitel-

[1] l. c.
[2] p. 47 sq.
[3] Hengstenb., Auberlen.
[4] Volkm. urges that in xiii. 3, it is not said that the beast was wounded on its head, etc. But what in ver. 3 he is wrong in omitting, is correctly said in ver. 12.

lius), could in any way be regarded the restorer of the empire which was destroyed with Nero. The healing of that mortal wound did not ensue until Vespasian, the founder of a new dynasty, restored the empire, as its actual possessor, to its ancient strength and vitality. Thus, at the foundation of the prophetical enigmatical discourse of the writer of the Apoc. concerning the beast wounded to death and again restored, concerning the three coroneted horns which, nevertheless, do not stand upon particular heads (ver. 1), and concerning the beast which is not and yet is, there lies the same historical view which is declared by the Roman historians, in their representation of the threefold regency between the death of Nero and the accession of Vespasian, only as a sad interregnum.[1]

Ver. 3*b*, ver. 4. *καὶ ἐθαύμασεν — ὀπίσω τοῦ θηρίου.* The pregn. construction gives the view as to how the astonishment at the succession is occasioned.[2] Beng. also shows how this expression is supported historically: in the crucifixion, e.g., this prophecy is fulfilled. — The amazement of the whole earth — for thus far the dominion of the beast extends (ver. 2) — may be referred especially to what is said in ver. 3*a*; for the worship of the dragon, as also of the beast equipped by him, that which results from ver. 2*b* is expressly attached as the reason. But not only is the *προσκυνεῖν* on the part of the inhabitants of the earth[3] a robbery, which, in the service of the dragon and his beast, they perpetrate on the one true God, but even the phraseology in which they express their worship[4] seems like a blasphemous parody of the praise with which the O. T. Church celebrated the incomparable glory of the living God.[5] [See Note LXXI., p. 387.] And if the inhabitants of the earth declare further *καὶ τίς δύναται, κ.τ.λ.*, back of this challenging and triumphing question lies concealed the desire that, in compliance with the purpose of the dragon,[6] they might begin the conflict with those who do not worship the beast (cf. ver. 7).

Vv. 5–7. As the conception of the form of the beast in general (vv. 1, 2) is conditioned by the Danielian prototype, so also the individual chief features which describe the activity of the beast are in conformity with what Daniel says of antichrist. Not only the schematical determination of time for the antichristian activity of the beast, forty-two months,[7] is derived from Dan. vii. 25, xii. 7; but also the characteristic representation of the presumptuous, blasphemous speech,[8] and of his conflict with the saints,[9] makes the beast appear in the same way as the concretion of the antichristian world-power withstanding the N. T. communion of saints, as in Daniel's view Antiochus Epiphanes arrayed himself against the O. T. Church. But Züll.

[1] Sueton., l. c.; Dio Cass., *Hist. Rom.*, ed. J. Leuncl., Hannov., 1606, p. 7353.

[2] Cf. Acts. v. 37, xx. 30. Grot., Züll., De Wette, etc.

[3] Cf. ver. 8, iii. 10.

[4] Coccejus feels the difficulty of carrying out here his interpretation of the *θηρίον*; for, if the *θηρίον* is the papacy, it appears objectionable to represent its adherents as worshippers of the dragon. But he says: "In word, it is true, they praised God and Christ, who had given such power to the Church; but in fact, because it was not the Church, but a beast, and the worldly power which he claimed for himself was power conceded by the dragon transforming himself into an angel of light, he whom they adored was the dragon."

[5] Cf. Isa. xl. 25, xliv. 7, xlvi. 5; Ps. xxxv. 10, ciii. 5; Mic. vii. 8; Coccej., Ewald.

[6] xii. 17. [7] Cf. xi. 2, xii. 14.

[8] *στόμα λαλοῦν μεγάλα κ. βλασφ.* Cf. Dan. vii. 8, 20, 25. [9] Cf. Dan. vii. 21.

finds incorrectly also in 7*b* an analogy with Dan. vii. 14, in that the sense that what is there ascribed to Christ, is here declared concerning the antichristian universal monarchy of the beast, as the contrary of the Messiah; for the *ἐξουσία* of the beast, i.e., the definite supreme power thereof, adapted to its position and task, corresponds neither to the kingly glory over all nations granted to the Son of man,[1] nor to his peculiar *ἐξουσία*, which, as the *βασιλεία* itself, is marked as one that is eternal.[2] The *ἐδόθη*, vv. 5, 7,[3] which refers to the ultimate ground of divine authority, contains for believers a consolatory determination which belongs to the *ἔδωκεν*, ver. 2; for only in accordance with God's order can the dragon equip his beast, and only within the limits fixed by God can the beast work in virtue of the *ἐξουσία* ascribed to him. — *στόμα λαλοῦν μεγάλα καὶ βλασφημίας.* The supercilious speaking of great things is already in itself the testimony of an egotistic boasting of one despising the living God, and then becomes openly blasphemous when the presumptuous speeches have such definite reference to God as is expressed, e.g., in ver. 6; cf. also the declaration put, in ver. 4, into the mouth of the adherents of the beast. The historical foundation for the description, ver. 5*a*, is formed by the declarations repeated in various ways, in which Roman insolence not only ascribed to itself absolute dominion over the world, but also expressly gave divine names and divine honor to the city, the empire, and the emperor.[4] — *ποιῆσαι.* In the following accus., the express object to *ποιῆσαι* may be found,[5] and with Luther, Ewald, etc., the explanation may be rendered: Power was given him *to bring in forty-two months besides;* viz., in the manner described in ver. 5*a*. But this mere determination of time appears too circumstantial for the Apoc.; hence it is explained better by Vitr., Züll., De Wette, Hengstenb., etc., after the analogy of Dan. viii. 24, xi. 28, 30, 32; Ps. xxxvii. 5, where the *ποιεῖν* likewise occurs without any express designation of the object: power was given him *to work*, to ply his business, for forty-two months. In connection with this it is to be observed,[6] that thus the two parts of ver. 5 briefly designate what is more fully described in ver. 6 (cf. ver. 5*a*) and ver. 7 (cf. ver. 5*b*). — The prefixed *βλασφημίας πρὸς τὸν θεόν* (ver. 6) is more definitely specialized in a threefold way, to which already the plural *βλασφημίας πρ. τ. θ.*, which is here certain, points, viz., *first*, *βλασφημῆσαι τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ*, whereby is designated the calumniation directed immediately against God himself, which is especially fulfilled by the beast usurping for himself the divine names and honor; *secondly*, *καὶ τὴν σκηνὴν αὐτοῦ*, i.e., as it is also made manifest from the following words,[7] heaven, which, as *God's* tabernacle, is an object of the blasphemous speeches of the beast; and, *finally*, *καὶ τοὺς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ σκηνοῦντας*, because it is God's gracious work, that he has opened heaven as his tabernacle for those who now dwell with him therein. The two last kinds of blasphemy are mediate, but they have place just as certainly as the world-power, repre-

[1] καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ τιμὴ καὶ ἡ βασιλεία, καὶ πάντες οἱ λαοὶ φυλαὶ καὶ γλῶσσαι αὐτῷ δουλεύσουσιν.

[2] ἡ ἐξ. αὐτοῦ ἐξουσία αἰώνιος, ἥτις οὐ παρελεύσεται, κ.τ.λ.

[3] Cf. vi. 4, 8, vii. 2, ix. 5.

[4] Cf. Introduction, p. 51.

[5] Cf. Acts xv. 33; 2 Cor. xi. 25; Jas. iv. 13.

[6] Vitr., Hengstenb.

[7] Cf. xxi. 3.

sented by the beast, speaks only with mockery of that which was to believers the home towards which their entire hope was directed; and accordingly the world-power stood in opposition to the inexhaustible source of their consolation and patience. — *πόλεμον ποιῆσαι μετὰ τ. ἁγ.* To the instrument of the dragon it is given — on God's part — to fulfil what the dragon had in mind when he prepared the beast.[1] — *καὶ νικῆσαι αὐτούς*; viz., in so far as the saints must succumb to the power of the beast, and suffer imprisonment, banishment, death, and all kinds of *θλῖψις*.[2] Besides, it is just in this that the true victory of saints consists.[3] — *κ. ἐδ. αὐτ. ἐξουσία ἐπὶ πᾶσαν φυλὴν καὶ — ἔθνος.* Ewald, by determining the *ἐξουσία* according to the measure of what immediately precedes,[4] reaches the erroneous conception that the *ἐπὶ πᾶσ. φυλὴν, κ.τ.λ.*, is to be referred to Christians [5] But the expression designates, by its four specifications,[6] the entire number of the inhabitants of the earth who easily appear in opposition to the saints; hence the *ἐξουσία ἐπὶ πασ. φυλὴν, κ.τ.λ.*, is the great and sovereign power[7] which is granted to the beast with his empire. Because of this *ἐξουσία* he is in a position to war victoriously against the saints. But as in ver. 5*a*, so also here, where there is a definitive designation of the *ἐξουσία* on which the entire dreadful activity of the beast depends, the consolatory thought lies in the background, that even though the supreme power, which the dragon has *given* (ver. 2) to the beast, is so great that it extends over the whole world, yet it is at last only by the Divine bestowment, and therefore beneath the Divine order and limitation, that the beast possesses, and can exercise, his *ἐξουσία*.

Ver. 8. *καὶ προσκυνήσουσιν αὐτὸν, κ.τ.λ.* Notwithstanding ℵ (*αὐτῷ*), undoubtedly the correct reading, *αὐτόν*, cannot be explained by the reference to the king, of the masc. in which the beast itself, xvii. 11, appears personified;[8] for that entirely special idea must be definitely indicated within ch. xiii. if without any thing further it is thus to be diverted. The *αὐτόν* pertains, however, to the chief subject *ὁ δράκων*. The worship of the dragon is here mentioned immediately after the description of the beast, for the same reason as ver. 4 in connection with ver. 3; the more mightily the instrument of the dragon is presented to the inhabitants of the earth, the more naturally they come to the adoration of that which itself only serves the beast. Corresponding with this is also the future form *προσκυνήσουσιν*.[9] As the activity of the beast, according to its decisive part, still impends,[10] so also the adoration of the dragon occasioned thereby. — *οὐ οὐ γέγραπται τ. ὄν. αὐτοῦ*. The sing. of the relative,[11] to which, according to the Hebraic way, the demonstr. is added,[12] is explained[13] by the presentation of the details which are comprised in the entire *κατοικ. ἐπὶ τ. γ.* — *ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ, κ.τ.λ.* Without doubt,[14] the

[1] Cf. xii. 17, xiii. 2.

[2] Cf. xi. 7.

[3] Cf. xii. 11, ii. 10 sq.

[4] "It is allowed to perpetrate this slaughter throughout all lands and nations."

[5] "From the nature of the topic and thought, it is apparent that only Christians dwelling everywhere throughout the world are to be here understood."

[6] Cf. v. 9, xi. 9, xiv. 6, xvii. 15.

[7] Also Ew. ii.

[8] Hengstenb.

[9] Cf., on the other hand, ver. 4.

[10] Cf. ver. 7, where it is first given the beast, on God's part, what it is to do.

[11] See Critical Notes.

[12] iii. 8, xii. 6, 14.

[13] De Wette.

[14] Cf. xvii. 8.

concluding clause ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου belongs to γέγραπται,[1] not to the ἐσφαγμένου, as neither the explanation of the eternal predestination of the death of Christ,[2] nor that of the sufferings of Christ in his people from Abel on,[3] agrees with the expression and the connection of this passage. The characteristic of the inhabitants of the earth, in contrast with the saints refusing to worship the dragon, contains already, in the most pregnant manner, all the points upon which the patience of the saints expressly emphasized immediately afterwards, ver. 10, depends. Those who worship the Lamb slain, of course, must suffer persecution; but just to the Lamb slain belongs the book of life,[4] in which from eternity the names of believers are written: they, therefore, like the Lamb, conquer by their victory,[5] and through all θλῖψις pass to the glory of eternal life,[6] while the enemy, in spite of his temporary victory,[7] incurs sure judgment. [See Note LXXII., p. 387.]

Vv. 9, 10. This consolatory assurance is expressly urged as one extremely important.[8] — εἴ τις εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν, εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν. The *jus talionis* is exercised by the righteous judgment of God.[9] The brevity of the elliptical expression corresponds very well with the immutability of the strict sentence, in case the second εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν stands without further definition.[10] — On the two kinds of persecution, cf. ii. 10, 13, vi. 10, xi. 7. Volkm. regards the threat of the sword as directed against Nero. But how is it conceivable if ver. 3 refers, according to Volkmar's interpretation, to Nero? — ὧδε ἐστι ἡ ὑπομονή, κ.τ.λ. The formula ὧδε ἐστιν is in itself so indefinite that it can express both gradations of the idea: "Here must the patience, the wisdom,[11] of believers be displayed,"[12] and "Here patience is present, here lies its foundation and source." In this passage, and xiv. 12, the latter idea results from the connection; by the ὧδε, κ.τ.λ., an allusion is made to what has just been said, ver. 10, yea already in ver. 8; viz., to that in which the patience of the saints consists, who by their faith lay hold of that divine consolation. Otherwise, ver. 18 and xvii. 9.

Vv. 11–17. The second beast, which John sees rising from the earth, is described as an accomplice of the first beast; by deceitful speeches and miraculous signs, he leads astray the inhabitants on earth to the worship of the beast from the sea. — That this second θηρίον — which appears in this form from the beginning as essentially related to the first beast[13] — is a personification of false prophecy, is correctly recognized already by Irenaeus.[14] John himself gives this interpretation, xvi. 13, xix. 20, xx. 10. But from the connection with vv. 1–10, the more restricted determination results, that the subject treated is that form of heathen-Roman prophecy which was just as magical as mantic; and this peculiarity, with all its auguries, interpretations of omens, etc., formed an important support of the Roman secular

[1] Hammond, Beng., Heinr., Ewald, Züll., De Wette, Hengstenb.
[2] 1 Pet. i. 20; Beda, Eichh.
[3] Cf. C. a Lap.
[4] iii. 5.
[5] Cf. iii. 21.
[6] Cf. vii. 14.
[7] Ver. 7.
[8] Ver. 9. Cf. ii. 7, 11.
[9] Cf. xviii. 6, xix. 2.
[10] ὑπάγει, xvii. 8. See Critical Notes.
[11] Ver. 18, xvii. 9.
[12] De Wette, Hengstenb.
[13] See on ver. 1.
[14] *L. V.*, c. 28, 2, ed. Stieren, I., p. 794.

power.[1] The various references to papal Rome[2] are precluded by the explanation of ver. 1 sqq. [Note LXXIII., p. 387.]

ἐκ τῆς γῆς. Incorrectly, Grot.: "private origin." Ewald's explanation that the continent of Asia[3] is to be regarded the theatre for those who had prophesied the return of Nero — even apart from the difficult limitation of the idea *τ. γῆς* — has no support in ver. 3.[4] The explanation also of Hengstenb., that by *ἐκ τ. γῆς* in contrast with *ἐκ τῶν ἄνω*, or *ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*,[5] the earthly, worldly nature[6] is indicated, does not lie at all in the context. The *ἐκ τῆς γῆς*[7] has respect, on the contrary, to the idea of the *κατοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*. The beast rises from the earth, because he is to work upon the whole earth, and all the inhabitants of the earth[8] — *κέρατα δύο ὅμοια ἀρνίῳ*. The "compendious comparison"[9] is not acknowledged by Ebrard when he commends the explanation as probable: "The beast has two horns, like (*ὅμοιον* instead of *ὅμοια*) a lamb (so that, then, the horns also were like the horns of the lamb)." Concerning the form of this beast, nothing further is expressed than that it had two horns like the horns of a lamb. The interpretation of this figure must be mistaken, if, notwithstanding the omission of the art. before *ἀρνίῳ*, a contrast is immediately found to the Lamb with seven horns,[10] and it is then declared that the beast which has only two horns is far inferior in fulness of strength to that of the Lamb, although the similarity to Christ consists in that the wisdom also of this world is hidden,[11] or that the beast especially resembles the Lamb of God in the manner in which he exercises its dominion over the Church.[12] But while it is very difficult to regard the beast with his two horns of a lamb as in contrast with the Lamb with seven horns, a comparison with the beast out of the sea is readily made. This had ten horns, which must be further described in another respect; but the beast out of the earth has two horns, whose meaning lies in what is further said concerning them: they resemble the horns of a lamb, — even in their number they were no more than those of a lamb. The number has, therefore, in itself no special reference, — possibly in the same way as the ten horns (ver. 1),[13] — but only expresses, like the entire form of the horns, the resemblance to a lamb in the appearance of the beast, and designates the peculiarity of pseudo-prophetism, which, in Matt. vii. 15,[14] is symbolized in a somewhat different way. — *καὶ ἐλάλει ὡς δράκων*. The precise reference to the dragon, in whose service also this second beast stands,[15] forbids the omission

[1] Cf. Victorin., Andr., Hammond, Grot., Eichh., Ewald, De Wette; also Hengstenb.

[2] Coccej., Calov., Vitr., etc.

[3] Bengel, in his way, remarks: The earth is here also Asia, "to which already for a long time a greater part of the papal views . . . referred."

[4] See on that passage.

[5] Cf. John viii. 32.

[6] *ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου*.

[7] Cf. ver. 1, *ἐκ. τ. θαλ.*

[8] Cf., immediately afterwards, ver. 12.

[9] As ix. 10.

[10] v. 6.

[11] Hengstenb.

[12] Ebrard; who, after the manner of Vitr., etc., finds a fulfilment of the prophecy concerning the second beast, "in the papacy, with respect to its spiritual power." Vitr. interprets the two horns as referring more definitely to the two monastic orders.

[13] Against Wetst., who refers to Titus and Domitian; against Hammond, who explains: The twofold power of priests, viz., that of miracles and of prophecy.

[14] Cf. Beda, Andr., Ewald.

[15] Victorin.: "He spoke, full of the malice of the devil." Andr., etc. Cf. also Hengst-

of the art.; besides, no speaking of the dragon is at all mentioned by xii. 1. The ὡς δράκων[1] designates the crafty speech of the tempter.[2] An allusion, however, to the relation to the dragon — which also is not denied by Ewald, Züll., etc. — lies in the fact that he is described not as ὡς ὄφις, but as ὡς δρ[3]

Ver. 12. The second beast is expressly designated as standing in the relation of servitude to the first: the entire ἐξουσία given, he puts in operation, and that, too, ἐνωπίον αὐτοῦ, i.e., beneath the eyes of the first beast, as its lord.[4] — ποιεῖ — ἵνα προσκυνήσουσι. Cf. iii. 9. — οὐ ἐθεραπ., κ.τ.λ. This was indicated already (ver. 4) as the cause of the astonishing adoration.

Vv. 13, 14. σημεῖα μεγάλα. As, according to Matt. xxiv. 24, they belong to the seductive activity (ver. 14) of the false prophet.[5] — ἵνα καὶ πῦρ ποιῇ καταβαίνειν ἐκ τ. ουρ. With Beng., Hengstenb. recognizes here a significant example of the use of the ἵνα[6] in the sense of ὥστε peculiar to the Apostle John. But, improperly: the use of ἵνα, which in this passage, in fact, explains the conception of the μεγάλα,[7] is very strongly distinguished from the style of the Apostle John, because in the latter[8] the ideal statement of the purpose is actually included, while here the writer of the Apoc., in a mode widely different from the elegance of the apostle, describes something that is simply a matter of fact. In such case, the apostle infallibly writes ὥστε[9] or ὅτι.[10] — The words ἵνα καὶ πῦρ, κ.τ.λ., should not be regarded as proving that the false prophet intends to mimic Pentecost,[11] or wishes to represent himself as a second Solomon. We are much more apt to think of an allusion to the miracles of Elijah,[12] and thus to regard this false prophet as a forerunner of antichrist, in a way similar to that according to which the true Christ had an Elias[13] as a forerunner. But the analogy dare not be determined more specifically than the context itself suggests. It is not the antichrist in the sense of the Apostle John,[14] but the dragon that in the Apoc. stands opposed to Christ,[15] and it is not the forerunner, but the accomplice, of the dragon, that is the other beast whose ungodly and antichristian nature expresses itself in the fact that in virtue of his demoniacal power he can perform miracles, which appear to be counterparts of the miracles of the true prophets. — καὶ πλανᾷ. The miracles are an important auxiliary[16] of the seduction.[17] — λέγων, without construction, as xi. 1. — ποιῆσαι εἰκόνα τῷ θηρίῳ, κ.τ.λ. The historical foundation of this description is indicated already in the Introduction.[18] All images of deified emperors must have appeared to the Christian conscience as images of the beast, the more certainly as all

enb.: "As a dragon," in fact, as well as "as the dragon."

[1] Cf. Gen. iii. 1 sqq.; Ewald, De Wette.

[2] Cf. ver. 14, πλανᾷ, with Gen. iii. 13.

[3] Cf. xii. 9.

[4] Cf. ver. 14, viii. 2; 1 Kings x. 8; Num. iii. 6. De Wette, Hengstenb.

[5] Victorin.: "These things the Magi do also to-day through fallen angels."

[6] The variation καὶ πῦρ ἵνα ἐκ τ. οὐρ. καταβαίνῃ (Griesb., De Wette) would contain a turn similar to that of ver. 12, viz., καὶ (sc. ποιεῖ) πῦρ, κ.τ.λ.

[7] Cf. Winer, p. 430.

[8] Cf., e.g., 1 John iii. 1, with my note, vol. ii., p. 49.

[9] John iii. 16.

[10] 1 John iv. 9.

[11] Beda.

[12] 2 Chron. vii. 1. C. a Lap.

[13] Cf. xi. 3 sqq.

[14] Cf. Introduction, p. 65.

[15] xii. 3 sqq., xiii. 1 sqq.

[16] διὰ τ. σ., because of the miracles. Cf. xii. 11.

[17] Matt. xxiv. 24: ὥστε πλανήσαι.

[18] p. 51 sq.

those individual emperors were possessors of the same antichristian secular power. Hence the addition ὃ ἔχει τ. πλ., κ.τ.λ.,[1] is also again in place here; the statues of Augustus and Caligula, erected to them as gods, were also represented by the beast which received its wound only with Nero's death.

Ver. 15. To the second beast, it was further given (ἐδόθη, cf. ver. 7): δοῦναι πνεῦμα τῇ εἰκόνι τοῦ θηρίου, i.e., to give that image of the beast a demoniacal πνεῦμα ζωῆς,[2] and that, too, with the intention (ἵνα καὶ λαλ.) that this might thereby speak, and also by this sign of life manifest his usurped divine glory — which must be adored (ver. 15*b*). Ver. 15*a* must not be understood of a speaking of the spirit of heathen idols;[3] but this feature of the description contains a suggestion of what has been reported concerning divine images actually speaking;[4] and John appears[5] to presuppose the reality of such demoniacal miracles. — Significant, besides, is the statement that the idol of the first beast had not the power to speak of itself, nor with the rough force with which the beast ruled the world, but that the intellectual power of the lying wisdom of the world must give that beast living speech. The false prophet with his πλανᾶν belongs thereto, if that beast is to find worship. — Incorrect is the special reference in Victorin.: "He will cause a golden image *to antichrist* to be placed *in the temple at Jerusalem*, and the vanishing angel to enter, and to give thence voices and decisions." — κ. ποιήσῃ ἵνα — ἀποκτανθῶσι. On the construction, cf. ver. 12. On the historical illustration of this testimony, as in the letter of Pliny to Trajan.[6]

Vv. 16, 17. καὶ ποιεῖ πάντας — ἵνα δῶσιν αὐτοῖς χαρ. — καὶ ἵνα μή τις, κ.τ.λ. The first ἵνα, just as ver. 12; the second ἵνα (ver. 17) has a different relation to the ποιεῖ, which is to be regarded as repeated before it, in so far as here an immediate determination of the object is lacking. — John describes how the entire number of worshippers of the beast,[7] who recognize one another by a mark which certifies that they belong to the beast, hinder the intercourse, required even in business with respect to their daily life, of saints who have not received that mark of the beast. — δῶσιν αὐτοῖς χάραγμα. Deceived by the second beast unto the worship of the first beast (ver. 14), the dwellers on the earth put a mark upon themselves; they receive it willingly.[8] — ἐπὶ τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῶν τῆς δεξιᾶς ἢ ἐπὶ τὸ μέτωπον αὐτῶν. Züll. and Hengstenb. unjustly resist the acknowledgment[9] that the idea contains an allusion to the heathen custom of branding slaves and soldiers, and thus of designating that they

[1] Cf. ver. 12. On the κ. ἔζησεν, cf. ii. 8. On the neut. ο ἔχ., see Critical Notes.

[2] Cf. xi. 11.

[3] Against Hengstenb., who remarks how the heathen in his idol objectified his own views, and that, too, with a vividness which was attested by the assertions of actual speech on the part of those images.

[4] Cf. Grot., Ew. ii., who also recalls the popular deception of speaking statues of Mary.

[5] Cf. also ver. 13.

[6] L. X., ep. 97: "When they invoked the gods, and with wine and frankincense made supplication to your image, which, for that purpose, I had commanded to be brought together with the statues of the deities, none of which things, as is said, those who are really Christians can be forced to do." Those who remain faithful must die: "Threatening also to punish them with death. Such as persisted, I ordered them to be led away." Cf., concerning the Neronian persecution, Tacit., *Ann.*, xv 44.

[7] The specifications τ. μικρους κ. τ. μεγ., κ.τ.λ., exhaust in a perceptible way the idea of the πάντας. Cf. vi. 15, xi. 18, xix. 18.

[8] Cf. xiv. 9, 11, xvi. 2, xix. 20, xx. 4.

[9] Grot., Ebrard, etc.

belong to the same master. It is just concerning this that the treatment refers, and not with respect to a counterpart of Deut. vi. 8; for the *χάραγμα* of the worshippers of the beast is to mark them as such, and to render them distinguishable as of the same nature, but in itself by no means contains an admonition of a service of the beast to which they are bound. The reminiscence of the Gentile custom is the more natural here, as the worshippers of the beast are partners in the Gentile-Roman Empire. The *χάραγμα*, however, is not the bringing together by a "confession,"[1] but it is the definite external mark indicated in both its forms in ver. 17, which is attached either to the forehead or the right hand, and thus in places most readily presented to the eyes; for, since it is intended only for visibility, whether it be attached to the one or the other place is a matter of indifference.[2] Inappropriately, Hengstenb. says: "The forehead is the most suitable place for the confession" (? Rom. x. 10), and the right hand comes into consideration "as the instrument for action." But just because the parallel assertion *ἐπὶ τ. μέτωπον αὐτ.* does not allow any other reference than to the convenient visibility of the mark, the *ἐπὶ τ. χεῖρ. αὐτ. τ. δεξ.* also cannot have any deeper reference. The *right* hand is mentioned because this must manifest itself especially in daily use. — The nature of the signature contained by the *χάραγμα* is definitely expressed in ver. 17: *τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θηρίου, ἢ τὸν ἀριθμὸν τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ*, i.e., either the express name by which the beast is known, and therefore written in letters, or the number which gives the numerical value of the letters contained in the name.[3] In every respect perversely, Coccejus says that the *χάραγμα* is the law, the *ὄνομα* the Catholic Church, and the *ἀριθμ.* unwritten tradition.

Ver. 18. As John wants to designate the *χάραγμα* definitely, and that, too, in the form of the *ἀριθμὸς τοῦ ὀνόματος* of the beast (ver. 17), he mentions first of all, that wisdom and understanding are required for the comprehension of this mysterious mark. The formula *ὧδε ἡ σοφ. ἐστιν* receives its peculiar meaning[4] through the context, especially through the express demand *ὁ ἔχων νοῦν ψηφισάτω, κ.τ.λ.* A reckoning (*ψηφισάτω*) is properly required, because the subject has reference to a number, and the value of its letters; yet the invitation to solve the puzzle intelligibly is supported by the explicit remark that the solution can actually be found,[5] because the number is meant in the ordinary way: *ἀριθμὸς γὰρ ἀνθρώπου ἐστίν.* These words do not declare that the number describes the name of any particular human person,[6] — in order to express which, John would have had to attach a *τινὸς*, or, after his way,[7] a *ἑνὸς*, to *ἀνθρ.*, — but, as also the *γὰρ*, and the omission of the art. before *ἀριθμ.* indicate, that the *ἀριθμὸς τοῦ θηρίου* express the *ὄνομα τοῦ θηρίου* in a human way, and therefore according to the value of the letters current with

[1] Against Hengstenb., who yet himself remarks that the confession has an impulse for an external sign.

[2] Cf., on the other hand, vii. 3.

[3] Cf. De Wette, etc.

[4] Cf. ver. 10.

[5] Against Irenæus, *L. V.*, c. 30. Cf. Intro., p. 75. Andr.: *ὁ χρόνος ἀποκαλύψει.* Hofmann, who even assumes that John himself did not know the name signified by the number; Luthardt, etc. Cf. Intro., p. 42.

[6] Beda, Grot., Ew. i., Züll., Hofm. (*Schriftbew.*, ii. 637), Volkm., Klief., etc.

[7] viii. 13.

every one. The key to the mystery of the numerical name is, therefore, readily found; but wisdom and understanding are necessary in order to use this key properly. That this is not so easy, the history of the exposition shows, as it[1] gives the report of hundreds of attempts to solve the puzzle, which failed just because it was not understood, on the part of the large number of men which may contain the names of thousands, how to decipher the only correct name. — With the statement of this riddle John concludes the description of the beast, which thus reaches the most significant climax: *καὶ ὁ ἀριθμὸς αὐτοῦ χξς΄*. The *αὐτοῦ* belongs to the conception *τοῦ θηρίου*,[2] just as *ψηφ. τ. ἀριθμὸν τ. θηρ.* was expressed, yet in the sense that the *ἀριθμ. τοῦ θηρίου* is meant as the *ἀριθμ. τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ θηρ.*, ver. 17. — Without all doubt the number to be indicated means *χξς΄*, i.e., 666; for what Irenaeus[3] reports of those who received the number *χις΄*, 616, is the less applicable for causing any doubt with respect to the certainty of the received reading *χξς΄*, as Irenaeus himself decidedly advocates the latter reading by asserting for it the authority of *all* good and ancient MSS., and an express tradition which he derived from the author of the Apoc. himself. — In order to find the interpretation of the enigmatical number commended by John to Christian understanding, the indications afforded by the nearer and more remote context are certainly to be observed, which show the entire class of attempts at interpretation to be impossible, and urge the correct interpretation: —

(1) All expositors enter into an erroneous course who, in spite of the declaration of the text, understand the number *not* as *τὸν ἀριθμὸν τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ θηρίου*; i.e., who have held it as any thing else than a definite name expressed in numbers. Therefore, not only is such play-work to be rejected of itself, as that of Zeger[4] and of Coccejus,[5] but also all Apocalyptic chronology based upon the number 666. With what confidence this was formerly held, is to be seen from the fact that in the Wittenberg Bible of the year 1661, the note (Luther's gloss) is given: "It is 666 years: so long does the worldly papacy stand." The master in the sphere of Apocalyptic arithmetic — in which men even like Isaac Newton have erred[6] — was Bengel, whose piety remains worthy of respect because it believed that even in the spaces

[1] Cf. Wolf, *Curae*, on this passage; Heinrichs, *Excursus* iv., *De antichristo, et imprimis monogrammate illo, cap xiii. 18, numerum exprimente*, vol. ii. p. 235. Züllig, *Excurs.* ii., 232.

[2] This reference is not, as Klief. says, "an evasion," but a philological necessity, which, of course, cannot be acknowledged, if, upon the basis of ver. 18 (*ἀρ. γ. ἀνθρ.*), it be asserted (Klief.) that the beast is a man, since the number of the beast designates a man. But in truth, the *ἀνθρ.* is only a qualitative designation of the *ἀριθμὸς*, so that it is directly impossible to refer the *αὐτοῦ* in the closing words to *ἀνθρ.* It can refer only to the chief conception which is designated by repetition in ver. 17 (*τ. ἀρ. τ. ὀν. αὐτοῦ*) and ver. 18 (*τ. ἀρ. τοῦ θηριοῦ*).

[3] L. V., c. 30: "I do not know how it is that some have erred, following the ordinary mode of speech, and have vitiated the middle number in the name, deducting fifty numbers, wishing that only one be instead of six decades. This I think was the fault of the copyists," etc.

[4] Viz., that the name Legion, Luke viii. 30, is meant, viz., six thousand six hundred and sixty-six, but after a withdrawal of six thousand caused by Christ's victory.

[5] Viz., that the Catholic additions to apostolic doctrine are meant, the *jus canonicum*, especially the *liber sextus*, since the number six remains if six hundred and sixty-six be divided by twelve.

[6] Cf. Lücke, p. 1036.

of time which are regarded as revealed in the Apoc., the holy ways of God are to be discerned, although not only is the excessive curiosity which muddled that piety reproved by the wording and spirit of Acts i. 7. Matt. xxiv. 36,[1] but also the entire theory, as it is built by Bengel upon this text, is deprived of a foundation and basis by making the text itself speak of nothing *less* than of 666 years. Bengel's system of Apocalyptic chronology depends essentially upon the fact, that, in order to gain first an arithmetical proportion upon which to work, he combines the 666 years, as ordinary years, with the 3½ times or 42 "prophetical months,"[2] that thereby he may attain the various chronological determinations,[3] which he then applies to the history of the popes.

(2) Against the method, given in the text, for finding the name of the beast from the number 666, in such a way that the numerical value of the letters forming the concealed name gives that sum, Vitringa and Hengstenb. object, with their peculiar interpretation, rejected already by Vitr. and Coccejus. Because, in Ezra ii. 13, a head of a family, Adonikam, with 666 sons, is mentioned, the Apoc. number is therefore regarded as referring to this name, אֲדֹנִיקָם (the Lord sets up), and thus, in the sense of ver. 4,[4] the antichristian arrogance of the beast deifying itself is indicated. Besides, Hengstenb. finds even in the number 666 itself the sign of that which is contrary to God, because, "as the swollen six," it always remains a world-number, and can never be reduced to the godly number seven.[5] But even apart from this last mode of trifling, and without considering that it yields a Hebrew name, — while only a Greek name is to be expected, — a mere play-work would be found therein, entirely spiritless, and not in harmony with the holy earnestness of John, if, without all inner reference to the supposed name, it would be referred to the number of children of Adonikam. Yet the name Adonikam could be meant in the assumed sense if that head of a family had had 777 sons.

(3) We have not only in the wording of vv. 17, 18, the clear direction for seeking a name in the enigmatical number; but the Apoc. as a whole, and the context of ch. xiii. especially, compel us to reckon that name from no other than the *Greek* alphabet. A scientific expositor at the present day no longer attempts to introduce the Latin alphabet[6] or those of modern languages.[7] It is only either the Greek or the Hebrew alphabet that can

[1] In a remarkable way, Bengel (*Erkl. Offenb.*, p. 1090) attempts to prove that Acts i. 7 does not testify against his method of "Apocalyptic chronology." The Lord, he says, gave his apostles "no pure repulse," but only informed them that the knowledge of the day and hour did not belong to the apostolic *office*.

[2] xii. 6, 14.

[3] 666⅔, 777⅔ years.

[4] 2 Thess. ii. 4.

[5] Cf. C. a Lap. and Luthardt, who refer the antichristian number 666 as in antithesis to the number 888 with which in the *Sibyll. Orac.*, L. I., p. 176, ed. Serv. Gall., the name Ἰησοῦς is described; Herd., etc., mention that the serpentine form ξ occurs between the letters χς, i.e., the monogram of the name of Christ.

[6] Cf. Bossuet's interpretation: DIoCLes aVgVstVs = Diocles or Diocletian Augustus, by reckoning only one part of the letters. Similar artificial expedients in Vieg. and the Catholics, who derived the names Martin Luther, John Calvin, Beza antitheos, and the like, reckoning sometimes in German, and sometimes in Greek and Hebrew; while, on the contrary, the old Protestants conjectured the names of Popes, Jesuits, etc.

[7] Cf. Gerken, with his numerous interpretations with respect to the history of Napoleon.

enter into consideration. The application of the latter is apparently urged by the O. T. character of the Apoc.[1] Zullig thus finds the name Balaam in the designation of Josh. xiii. 33, which,[2] however, has nothing to do with the θηρίον of whose name it treats. Such interpretations would suit better, as that invented by Ewald for the (false) number 616, רום קיסר, i.e., Cæsar at Rome, or that received by Hilgenf., Renan, etc.,[3] נרון קסר,[4] if the presumption that Nero were to be identified with the beast were correct,[5] and if the introduction of the Hebrew alphabet were not arbitrary. Irenaeus, Primas, Victorin., Beda, Andr., Areth., Wetst., Grot., Calov., Eichh., Ew. i., De Wette, Stern, Rinck, Lücke, Bleek, etc., are correct in their attempt to find the number indicated by the name in the Greek alphabet; for although the Apoc., in its entire mode of presentation and in its style, shows a strongly impressed O. T. type, yet it is intended for the Greek-speaking reader, and, therefore, takes the formula Α and Ω[6] from the Greek alphabet, as also, in its references to O. T. passages, it is not altogether independent of the version of the LXX.[7] But of the Greek interpretations that have been attempted, most miscarry, because they are either in form intolerable, or without meaning and definite reference. Here belong the solutions εὐάνθας, ἀντεμος,[8] ἀρνούμε,[9] τειταν,[10] ὁ νικητής,[11] ἀντίδοκος,[12] Οὔλπιος,[13] λαμπέτης, κακὸς ὀδηγος, ἄμνος ἄδικος, etc.[14] Ingenious is the solution commended by Märcker.[15] He reckons, according to the Greek alphabet, the numerical value of the initials of the names of the emperors, from Octavianus to the tenth following, Vespasian, inclusive of the three emperors of the interregnum, — Galba, Otho, and Vitellius, — by reckoning the numerical sign ι as the tenth, and so obtaining the letters ο′, τ, γ′, κ′, υ, γ′, ο′, ο′, ο′, ι, which, according to their numerical value, give correctly 666, and besides can be combined in the name of the beast, ὀγκόπογων, so that the result is an indication of the vastness and pride (ὄγκος), and of the peculiar garment (*toga*) in the Roman Empire. This solution is a flagrant act of trifling, to which, besides, a counterpart is offered. It is false, therefore, already, because nothing justifies us in taking the names of the ten emperors as a basis, among which the last is figured only as a numerical sign. The combined name of the beast expresses little. — Kienlen, resorting to the Hebrew alphabet, derives the name of Domitian. — Kliefoth says that no name whatever is mentioned, but only the antichristian character of the beast, which, in every gradation of the world-power indicated by the number six, does not, nevertheless, reach the number seven which symbolizes the divine. — Irenaeus already was acquainted with that solution of the puzzle, which alone corresponds

[1] Cf. Introd., p. 63.

[2] Only that Zull., in order to conform to the number 666, must put סכם instead of the הקוסם.

[3] Cf. De Wette.

[4] It ought to be קיסר נ, i.e., Nero Cæsar.

[5] Cf., on the other hand, on ver. 3.

[6] I. 8, xxii. 13.

[7] Cf. xii. 5.

[8] Interpreted as "contrary to honor."

[9] Interpreted "denying." Both these interpretations rejected already by Beda.

[10] Irenaeus, Beda, Wetst., found therein an allusion to the Emperor Titus.

[11] Stern.

[12] Rinck, who has to reckon the smooth breathing as 1, in order to avoid the result 665.

[13] Interpreted "*Ulpius Trajan*," which must reckon *as* instead of αϛ.

[14] Cf., already, Andr.

[15] *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1868, p. 699.

to all demands, — Λατεῖνος, i.e., according to the value of the letters: 30 + 1 + 300 + 5 + 10 + 50 + 70 + 200 = 666. So Calov., Eichh., Ew. i., De Wette, Ebrard, etc. Irenaeus, indeed, preferred the name Τεῖταν, yet said: "But the name Λατεῖνος also has the number 666, and it is very probable, since the last kingdom has this name. For the Latins are they who now rule." Against this interpretation it dare not be objected, that the usual form of the name is Λατῖνος; for although this is never found in analogous forms, like Σαβεῖνος, Παπεῖρος, etc., the very nature of the case has determined such a departure from what is usual, for the sake of the riddle. Yet, e.g., in the sibylline books,[1] the name χρῖστος is changed into χρεῖστος, because in the acrostic description of the words Ἰησοῦς χρῖστος, θεοῦ υἱος, κ.τ.λ., not ι, but only an ει, can be introduced. But if the name of the beast be Λατεῖνος, there is conveyed by this numerical name the most definite designation of the beast as the *Roman* Empire, not of any individual emperor, and the exposition of ch. xiii. 1 sqq., is expressly confirmed. [See Note LXXIV., p. 388.]

Notes by the American Editor.

LXX. Ver. 1 sqq. θηρίον ἀναβαῖνον, κ.τ.λ.

On this *crux interpretum*, we will attempt only to summarize the results of the thoughtful and sober discussion of Gebhardt ("The Doctrine of the Apocalypse," E. T., pp. 219–230), who constantly refers to, and often dissents from, Düsterdieck: There can be no doubt that the beast stands in the closest relation of nature to the dragon (cf. xiii. 1, xvii. 3, 7, with xii. 3), and that the latter is, in the eye of the seer, the antigod, and the former the antichrist. But this antichrist is not a single person; for xiii. 1, 2, shows that the seer had in mind Dan. vii. 2–7. The beast is accordingly not a person, but an empire, and that, too, the latest and most extreme, reproducing in itself all earlier phases of the world's enmity to God. Yet as the individual forms of world-power appear to the seer to culminate in an empire which he calls "the beast," so he sees again the particular stages of the development of this empire, the individual rulers of the same culminate in one prince, whom he also describes as "the beast" (xvii. 10, 11); as the leopard, the bear, and the lion are contained in the beast, so are the seven heads of the beast contained in the one head. As he sees in an individual king the nature of a definite empire, uniting in itself all earlier empires, personified, so also he sees unfolded in this empire the nature of that individual king. This empire could not have been any other than the one of John's own times, the Roman Empire. [Farrar: "The Roman emperor could say with truth, '*L'état c'est moi.*'"] The king must be Nero, and not Domitian, as Düsterdieck argues; "the one who is" of xvii. 10 being Galba, and not, as Düsterdieck holds, Vespasian. Düsterdieck's historical application of the *rebellio trium principum*, the *incertum et quasi vagum*, and the foundation of a new dynasty by Vespasian, is also charged as being seriously at fault. On the details of the description, the *sea* is regarded as "the department of earthly movement and earthly occurrences, in distinction from the earth, as the

[1] L. VIII., p. 723, ed. Serv. Gall.

department of earthly being and feeling," i.e., the Roman Empire, "arises out of secular history;" "*the names of blasphemy*," the titles by which Roman emperors appropriated to themselves divine honors, etc. The Nero-legend is rejected in the form that refers to his withdrawal and abode among the Parthians, "but in the eye of the seer, Nero lived, if we may call that a life, in the abyss; he went alive down to hell, and from hell would one day return." Alford argues against any reference to an emperor, and conceives of the whole representation as signifying the Roman Empire personified; "the wounding of the head to death" (ver. 3) being interpreted of the downfall of the pagan, and "the healing of the wound," of the establishment of the Christian Empire.

LXXI. Ver. 4. *Τίς ὅμοιος τῷ θηρίῳ.*

Gebhardt: "The seer observes what an imposing, overpowering, transporting impression the Roman Empire exercises upon men; how the world is astonished at it; that it is amazed by its greatness, power, and glory, and does homage to it; how the world worships the dragon, because he has given power to the beast, — that is, not consciously worshipping the devil, but perceiving, in imperial power, and in its individual possessors, supposed manifestations of the divine, it really gives divine honors to the devil." Carpenter: "The spirit of the wild beast is adored wherever worldliness prevails. There is nothing so successful as success, and the homage of men is more often paid to power than to principle. 'Can you not hear the words coming across the centuries from the lips of two Roman youths, talking with each other as they lounge about the Forum?' (Maurice.) Can we not hear the echo of the words in the Champs Elysées, in Piccadilly, in the Broadway, or *Unter den Linden*, from the lips of young men who have taken fashion, rank, wealth, world-power in any shape, as their god?"

LXXII. Ver. 8. *ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου.*

In favor of the translation in our A. V., is the distance of this clause from the *γέγραπται*. 1 Pet. i. 19, 20, John xvii. 24, are sometimes cited as supporting "slain from the foundation;" but the shade of meaning there expressed is different. Rev. xvii. 8 seems to be decisive in favor of the construction advocated by Düsterdieck; and it has, on the basis of this passage, been adopted by the American section of the committee on the R. V.

LXXIII. Ver. 11 sqq. *ἄλλο θηρίον.*

In harmony with Düsterdieck, Gebhardt: "Heathen witchcraft and soothsaying; the heathen religion as divination and magic according to its demoniacal origin and background, and its demoniacal influence on the mind." Ver. 12: "The idolatrous homage by which the empire was consecrated and strengthened, it owed to the demoniacal influence of its religion upon the mind." Ver. 13: "In its approaching climax of development, it will work wonders which will compare in appearance with the greatest miracles of the true prophets; for example, with those of an Elias." Ver. 14: "If the heathen religion, with its demoniacal power, had already deluded the world, much more will it be so in the expected completion of that power; and as already it consecrated images to

the Caesars for divine homage, as to gods, so with the appearance of the personal antichrist, it will fully bring the world to set him up as God, and to render him divine honors." Ver. 15: "The seer knew, and did not doubt, what was said among the heathen about speaking images; and he expected, therefore, that heathen sorcery would succeed in giving life, the spirit of life (cf. xi. 11), to the image of the beast, so that it would speak, and thus be fully manifested to the world in its usurped divinity. And, indeed, in his time it had already happened that Christians were put to death because they refused to pay divine honors to the emperor; so, naturally, would it be in the future, as John foresaw, that refusal to worship the speaking image, as in the case of Nebuchadnezzar (Dan. ii. 6), would end in death." Vv. 16, 17: "The Christians were already variously and seriously hindered in business, because in the Roman Empire the heathen religion penetrated and governed all civil relations. Indeed, in this respect, they were under a ban. There needed only one step more. The worshippers of the beast would willingly place the name, or number of the name, of the beast upon their right hands, or upon their foreheads, or in the most conspicuous places; and those who would not consent to this, Christians included, would be able neither to buy nor sell; they would be shut out from intercourse, banned, marked, and robbed of the vital air in civil and social life."

LXXIV. Ver. 18. ἑξακόσιοι ἑξήκοντα ἑξ.

Luthardt: "This number was transmitted also orally from the fathers, but not its meaning; this is a matter of the future, and all interpretations attempted are arbitrary. The best is still the ancient one: 'The Latin,' i.e., the antichrist, is the ruler of the Roman Empire. But the number is intended to designate the name of a person." Alford (*Prolegomena*): "Even while I print my note in favor of the Λατεινός of Irenaeus, I feel almost disposed to withdraw it. It is, beyond question, the best solution that has been given; but that it is not *the* solution, I have a persuasion amounting to certainty. It must be considered merely as worthy to emerge from the thousand and one failures strewed up and down in our books, and to be kept in sight till the challenge ὧδε ἡ σοφία ἐστίν is satisfactorily redeemed." Gebhardt suggests that both Λατεινός and Cæsar Nero in Hebrew letters are correct. Farrar (*Early Days of Christianity*, pp. 468–474) argues with much learning and great ingenuity for the latter interpretation.

CHAPTER XIV.

Ver. 1. *ἑστὸς*. So A, C, ℵ, al., Erasm., 1, 3, 4, 5. Ald., al., Lach., Tisch. 1859 and IX. [W. and H.]. Elz.: *ἑστηκός*, emendation. The *ἑστώς* (B., Beng., Tisch. 1854) testifies in favor of the correct reading, since only the masc. form expresses the reference to Christ. — *ὄνομα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ* before *ὄνομα τ. πατρ.* is omitted in the Rec., in opposition to almost all the witnesses. — Ver. 3. Before *ᾠδὴν καιν.*, A, C, Vulg., Lach. [W. and H.], have a *ὡς*, which is lacking in B, ℵ, al., Verss., Elz., Tisch., and may have been carried over from ver. 2. — Ver. 5. After the *ἄμωμοι*, the *γάρ* (B, ℵ, Copt., Syr., Orig., Elz., Tisch.) is possibly to be deleted (A, C, 12, Vulg., Lach. [W. and H.]); cf. ver. 4: *παρθ. γάρ εἰς*. Incorrect is the addition at the close in the Rec., *ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ θεοῦ*. — Ver. 6. *ἐπὶ τοὺς καθημένους*. So Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.], because the *ἐπί*, which stands also directly before *πᾶν ἔθνος*, is supported by A, C, ℵ, al. (it is lacking in B, Elz., Beng.), while the Rec. *τ. κατοικοῦντας* (A, Lach., small ed.) gives only the more usual expression (xiii. 8, 12, 14) against B, C, ℵ, al. — Ver. 8. Instead of *ὅτι* (Elz.), read *ἤ* with A, C, Lach., Tisch. Both are lacking in Beng. — Ver. 13. *ἀναπαήσονται*. So A, C, ℵ, Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]. The form *ἀναπαύσωνται* (Elz., B: *ἀναπαύσονται*) is a modification. — *τὰ δὲ ἔργα*. So Elz., Beng., Tisch., according to B, al., Andr., Areth. The well-attested reading *τὰ γὰρ ἔργα* (A, C, ℵ, al., Vulg., Lach., Tisch. IX. [W. and H.]) is liable to suspicion as an attempt at interpretation. — Ver. 15. The *σοι* after *ἦλθεν* (Elz.) is incorrect (A, B, C, ℵ, Beng., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]). — Ver. 18. *ὁ ἔχων*. So Lach., Tisch., according to A, C. The article causing a difficulty is omitted already in B, ℵ (Elz., Beng., Griesb., Tisch. IX.) [bracketed in W. and H.]. — The plural *ἥκμασαν αἱ σταφυλαὶ* (Elz., Lach., Tisch. IX. [W. and H.]), is of course, easier than the sing. (Tisch., according to B), but is defended as adequate by A, C, ℵ, al. — A, C, ℵ, advocate *αὐτῆς* (Elz., Lach., Tisch. IX. [W. and H.]), while B offers *τῆς γῆς*. — Ver. 19. *τὸν μέγαν*. So A, B, C, Tisch., Lach. [W. and H.]. The Rec., *τὴν μεγάλην* (ℵ), is purely an emendation.

After the description of the secular power threatening believers (ch. xiii., cf. also xii. 12, 17) has shown how the proper originator of all the calamity, which has been prepared for believers, is no less than Satan himself, there now follows — in consolatory contrast to that terrible picture — an account which, with its two parts (vv. 1–5, vv. 6-20), serves essentially to give emphatic force to the thoughts that obtruded themselves already in xiii. 9, 10, in the midst of the description of the antichristian enemies. This contrast between chs. xiv. and xiii. lies not only in the contents in itself, but is also expressly marked by the definite retrospective allusions to ch. xiii. (cf. especially ver. 8 sqq.). — In like manner, just as in ch. vii. 9 sqq., an inspiriting prospect of the heavenly glory of believers abiding faithful in the great tribulation still impending, is afforded before this trouble itself is

stated, so also in the first part of ch. xiv. (vv. 1–5), a scene is represented which in a multitude of departed believers (ver. 1, one hundred and forty-four thousand, ver. 4, *ἀπαρχή*), who appear with the Lamb on Mount Zion, and are described as such as have kept their earthly life free from all defilement of the world, manifests the glorious rewards of the victors.[1] — In another way the second vision (ver. 6 sqq.) brings the incentive to patience;[2] viz., by the declaration of the Divine judgment infallibly pertaining to the antichristian secular power. The latter account is presented with such elegance that the outline of the entire Apoc., at least seemingly forgotten, is stated again more definitely. The nearer we come to the final catastrophe, the more clearly is the analogy in the appearance of the vision to be known, as the end is organically developed from the beginning: the seven vials of wrath (xv. 1 sqq.) appear in the same relation to the trumpets (viii. 2–xi. 19) as the latter do to the seven seals (v. 1–viii. 1), so that from the standpoint to which xiv. 6–20 already leads, and which is again expressly adopted in xv. 1, the apparent chasm between ch. xi. and ch. xii. completely vanishes.

Ver. 1. *καὶ εἶδον, καὶ ἰδού.* The formula[3] marks the unexpected, forcible contrast to the preceding vision.[4] — *τὸ ἀρνίον.* Since the Lamb appears as the leader of the glorified,[5] not only does the contrast between Christ and Satan, with his dragon-form, stand forth in startling relief; but the form of the Lamb also reminds us that the Lord himself has by his sufferings and death attained the victory,[6] therefore his people must follow him; and that the redemption of believers (ver. 4), and their glorification, depend upon the blood of the Lamb.[7] — *ἑστός.* With the abbreviated form of the part.,[8] cf. the inf. *ἑστάναι*, 1 Cor. x. 12.[9] — *ἐπὶ τὸ ὄρος Σιών.* The failure to acknowledge the proper significance of the entire vision is connected no less with the arbitrary presumption that Mount Zion is to be regarded in heaven,[10] than with the allegorizing interpretation, according to which Mount Zion is regarded as the Christian Church.[11] Vitringa unites the reference of the whole to the true Church,[12] with the correct acknowledgment[13] that the locality represented in the vision is meant properly. Cf. similar local designations within the vision, which are to be understood with absolute literalness, vv. 6, 14, xiii. 1, 11, xii. 1, vii. 1. The holy place named, the home of the O. T. — and, therefore, also of the N. T.[14] — Church, is adapted like no other place for that which is displayed to the gazing John. With the Lamb there appear one hundred and forty-four thousand who have the name of the Lamb, and the name of his Father,

[1] Cf. ii. 11, iii. 12, 21.

[2] Cf. ver. 12, where the admonition is expressly made prominent.

[3] Cf. ver. 14, vi. 2, 5, 8.

[4] Hengstenb.

[5] Cf. vii. 17.

[6] Cf. v. 5 sqq., iii. 21.

[7] Cf. v. 9, vii. 14, xii. 11.

[8] Matt. xxiv. 15.

[9] Winer, p. 75.

[10] Grot., Eichh., Stern., Züll., Ew., Hengstenb., Ebrard, etc. Especially does Züllig explain: "The highest mountain-like vault of the firmament, which corresponded to Mount Zion, inasmuch as, according to the Israelitic idea, it lay directly beneath the same."

[11] Beda, C. a Lap., Calov., etc.

[12] In vv. 1–5 it is stated: "That in a false, there is a true Church" (cf. Laun.).

[13] De Wette.

[14] Cf. xii. 1, 17.

written on their foreheads. These one hundred and forty-four thousand are, according to the usual conception,[1] identical with those mentioned in ch. vii. 4. The number is the same; the seal there mentioned on the foreheads may be combined with the names of God which the followers of the Lamb have written on their foreheads; also the place, Mount Zion, appears to apply especially to glorified believers from Israel. But there are weighty reasons for the distinction of the one hundred and forty-four thousand in our text from those named in vii. 4.[2] [See, for the contrary, Note LIII., p 256, on ch. vii. 4.] 1. If John had wished here to designate those already mentioned in vii. 4, he would have expressed this definitely by the article. Cf. similar retrospective allusions in ver. 1 (*τὸ ἀρν.*), ver. 3 (*ἐν τοῦ θρ., τῶν τεσσ. ζ., τῶν πρεσβ.*). This was the more necessary, because here a particular description of the one hundred and forty-four *χιλιάδες* follows (*ἔχουσαι, κ.τ.λ.*), which could lead to an identity with the sealed only in case it be conceived that the seal had as an inscription the twofold names here designated; a conception which in itself has no difficulty, but is remote therefrom, because the sign of the seal has a designation and significance *different* from this sign of the name: there the fidelity, not to be affected by the impending trouble, is sealed, while here the name of God expresses the eternal and blessed belonging of believers to their heavenly Lord,[3] in contrast with those who have made themselves bondsmen of the beast. (Vv. 9, 11, xiii. 16 sq.) 2. To this must be added the fact, which may be decisive, that the one hundred and forty-four thousand in our passage, which, according to ver. 3 sqq., do not appear at all as from Israel, can be identified with those mentioned in vii. 4, only in case one of the two false conceptions, with respect to ch. vii.,[4] be sanctioned; viz., either that the one hundred and forty-four thousand (vii. 4) be regarded identical with the innumerable multitude (vii. 9 sqq.), or this multitude be regarded as a part of the one hundred and forty-four thousand. But it is rather to be said that in this passage only the schematic *number*, which as a designation of a mass suits mainly believers out of Israel (cf. vii. 4–8), is transferred to such as have completed their course, and designates not only the definite description, ver. 3 sqq., but especially also the antithesis lying in the entire context to the heathen worshippers of the beast, as those *springing from the heathen*.[5] This select band (cf. ver. 4) appears as such in the holy numerical sign of believers out of Israel; it is contained in the innumerable company, viz., as an *ἀπαρχή*.

Vv. 2, 3. *ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*. Cf. x. 4, 8. Many of the expositors who have transferred Mount Zion, ver. 1, to heaven, have[6] ascribed the voice from heaven to the one hundred and forty-four thousand themselves. Ew. ii.,

[1] Grot., Vitr., Beng., Eichh., Heinr., Ew., Züll., De Wette, Rinck, Hengstenb., Ebrard, Gebhardt, Hilgenf., Kliefoth.

[2] Areth., Laun., C. a Lap., Marck., Bleek, *Beitr.*, p. 184 sqq.; Neander, *History of the Planting and Training*, 3d ed., II., p. 543; Volkm. Vitr., already, is vacillating: "The same, or at least those of the same kind."

[3] Cf. iii. 12.

[4] See on that verse.

[5] It is worthy of note, how decidedly this passage contradicts also the pretended anti-Pauline Jewish Christianity of the author of the Apocalypse.

[6] As C. a Lap., Vitr., Beng., Hengstenb.

as in xii. 10 sqq., xix. 1 sqq., understands the voices as those of the martyrs, vii. 9 sqq. — *ὡς φων. ὑδάτων πολλ.* Cf. i 15. — *ὡς φων. βροντῆς μεγ.* Cf. vi. 1. The strength of the heavenly voice does not prevent its sounding at the same time charmingly, like the melody of players on the harp: *ὡς κιθαρῳδῶν, κ.τ.λ.*[1] The *ἐν*, which designates the instrument, is here still easier than in vi. 8. — *ᾠδὴν καινήν.* Cf. v. 9. The conception *καινήν* has nothing to do with the *ἀπαρχή*,[2] ver. 4; for the one hundred and forty-four thousand do not sing this song. In this passage, also, the relation of the *καινήν*, as to how this song is to be called because of its contents, is to be understood from the connection. The general reference to the work of redemption is not sufficient;[3] but the subject has reference to that which is displayed to the gazing prophet, through the vision presented to him, and therefore to the faithfulness of God and the Lamb, whereby believers, upon the ground of the redemption accomplished by Christ, are preserved amid all the enticements or persecutions, on the part of the antichristian secular power, and brought to victory and eternal glory.[4] — *ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου, κ.τ.λ.* There the song, according to its most inner relation, belongs, because it describes the blessed goal of God's ways, whose attainment was of itself pledged by the significant glory of the heavenly scene, ch. iv., upon which the entire arrangement of God's ways rests. — *καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐδύνατο μαθεῖν τ. ᾠδ., κ.τ.λ.* The one hundred and forty-four thousand, however, could learn this new song, i.e., not merely understand,[5] but also appropriate it so as to afterwards sing it,[6] because they alone have the experience of that which is celebrated in the song.[7] — *οἱ ἠγορασμένοι ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς.* On the thought, cf. 4, v. 9. The construction of the masc., with *αἱ χιλιάδες*, is according to the sense, as v. 13.

Vv. 4, 5. John describes the one hundred and forty-four thousand as a select number surpassing all other believers in moral perfection. The understanding of this description depends principally upon the proper arrangement and framing of the individual expressions. At the beginning and at the close two special points stand (ver. 4: *οὗτοι εἰσιν οἱ μετὰ γυναικῶν οὐκ ἐμολύνθησαν*; ver. 5: *καὶ ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτῶν οὐχ εὑρέθη ψεῦδος*); here, where the subject pertains to the past earthly life of those who have died, the aor. necessarily stands. In both cases the conclusion is by formulæ framed precisely in like manner (ver. 4: *παρθένοι γάρ εἰσιν*; ver. 5: *ἄμωμοι γάρ εἰσιν*); but here, where an advance is made from the definite actual preservation of the deceased, to their proper nature and permanent condition, the present necessarily occurs. Between the two double-membered sentences, in the beginning and at the close, there are besides two sentences, which are thereby exhibited as independent of one another and the beginning and closing sentences, in that they both commence with the special designation of the subject (*οὗτοι*), and that the first expresses something present (*οὗτ. εἰσιν οἱ ἀκολ.*), but the second something past, completed in the earthly life (*οὗτ. ἠγο-*

[1] Cf. v. 8.

[2] Against Beng.: "A new song suits well these first fruits."

[3] De Wette.

[4] Cf. Hengstenb.

[5] Grot., who besides evades: "No one could understand the cause of such joy."

[6] Ew., De Wette.

[7] Cf. ii. 17, also xix. 12.

ῥάσθησαν, cf. ver. 3). Hofmann[1] is the first expositor who keeps in view the disposition of vv. 4, 5; but he misjudges it by regarding the παρθένοι γάρ εἰσιν as immediately attracted to the succeeding words. The disposition attempted now also by Ew. ii., whereby three members appear (1. οὗτοί εἰσ., κ.τ.λ.; 2. οὗτ. εἰσ., κ.τ.λ.; 3. καὶ ἐν τ. στόμ., κ.τ.λ.), is in violation of the context. — οἱ μετὰ γυναικῶν οὐκ ἐμολύνθησαν. According to Lev. xv. 18, the sexual union in itself, even that in wedlock, was regarded as defiling.[2] — παρθένοι. This predicate was not seldom ascribed also to men.[3] In order to avoid the thoughts forced from the word, and not seldom made the best of by Catholic interpreters in the sense of monastic asceticism,[4] it is regarded either directly as figurative,[5] and referring to spiritual purity, especially to abstaining from the worship of idols,[6] or, if we abide by the proper sense of the words, to sexual purity, as an example of all virtues.[7] Hofm. attempts to remove the difficulty by saying that the declaration is concerning believers of the last time,[8] to whom celibacy will become a moral necessity, because of the special circumstances of those times. But nothing is said here concerning Christians of that time. The expedient of Bleek[9] and De Wette, who regard it as referring to abstinence from all lewdness, as it was ordinarily combined with the worship of idols, is forbidden by the expression μετὰ τ. γυναικῶν, which is altogether general. — Nothing else seems to remain than with Augustine,[10] Jerome,[11] Beda, Andr., to explain it in the proper sense, and to acknowledge the idea, to which also other points in the text lead,[12] that entire abstinence from all sexual intercourse belongs to the distinguished holiness of that one hundred and forty-four thousand,[13] because of which they enjoy also distinguished blessedness. [See Note LXXV., p. 404.] This is declared by the words immediately following: οὗτοι εἰσιν οἱ ἀκολουθοῦντες τῷ ἀρνίῳ ὅπου ἂν ὑπάγει. There is generally found here a description of the obedience of believers who follow the Lamb even to the cross and to death;[14] but because of the

[1] *Schriftbew.*, II. 2, p. 392.

[2] On the expression ἐμολύνθ., cf. Isa. lix. 3; 1 Cor. viii. 7; 2 Cor. vii. 1.

[3] Cf. Fabricius, *Cod. apocr. Vet. Test.*, II., pp. 92, 98 (where Joseph is called an ἀνὴρ παρθένος); Kypke, *Observ. sacr. ad h. l.* (παρθένον νία from Nonnus, on John xix. 26); Suidas, see on Ἀβελ.

[4] N. de Lyra, Stern.

[5] Cf. 2 Cor. xi. 2.

[6] Victorin., Zeger, Coccejus, Grot., Vitr., Wolf; cf. also Züll.

[7] Eichh., Beng., Hengstenb., who says that sexual intercourse, as legally defiling, is a figurative designation of sinful defilement in general.

[8] Cf. also C. a Lap.

[9] *Beitr.*, p. 135.

[10] *De s. virg.*, c. 27. *Opp. Antw.*, 1701, T. VI., p. 258.

[11] *Adv. Jovin.*, I. c. 40. *Opp. Francof*, 1684, T. II., p. 34.

[12] See above.

[13] So also Neander, p. 543, who, from this mode of contemplation, properly recognizes a mark that the writer of the Apoc. is not identical with the Evangelist John. — If the exposition above given be acknowledged, it must also be maintained (against Ew. ii.) that the view, which, to the writer of the Apoc., is fundamental, of the impurity of *all* sexual intercourse, is significantly distinguished from what is said in Matt. xix. 11 sqq., 1 Cor. vii. 32, 34, since here, under the express presumption that sexual intercourse in marriage is an ordinance which is divine, and by no means in itself impure, it is asserted that certain circumstances can make a complete abstinence from marriage possible and necessary. Possibly the too far-reaching statement of the writer of the Apocalypse is occasioned by the fact that he wishes to emphasize in the highest degree the contrast with the worshippers of the beast, i.e., the Gentiles, with their sexual abominations.

[14] Cf. Matt. x. 38. Coccej., Grot., Vitr., Wolf, who recall the fact that the soldiers were

present tense, which here expresses the present condition, — while the holy manifestation in the earthly life is designated by the aor., — there can be meant only a description of the blessed reward which those who have died are enjoying[1] with the Lamb.[2] It is meant that everywhere whither the Lamb goes, there that chosen one hundred and forty-four thousand accompany him; whether it be that a certain space in heaven remain inaccessible to other saints, or that the latter do not form the constant retinue of the Lamb, at least not in the same way as the former. — *οὗτοι ἠγοράσθησαν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀπαρχὴ τῷ θ., κ.τ.λ.* What applies to all the redeemed, viz., that they have been bought unto God by the blood of the Lamb, from among men, of the earth (ver. 3), or from all nations and kindreds (v. 9), applies in an eminent sense to the one hundred and forty-four thousand: they are bought as an *ἀπαρχή*. They appear, therefore, not as the select first fruits from the entire world,[3] but from believers, or, at any rate, from the blessed. The correlate to the *ἀπαρχή* is afforded by the context: *τῶν ἠγορασμένων*. As such select first fruits the one hundred and forty-four thousand appear, with respect both to their peculiar holiness (*παρθένοι*), and also their peculiar blessedness (*ἀκολ. τ. ἀρν., κ.τ.λ.*). — Besides distinguished virginity, in ver. 5 another peculiar perfection is mentioned, which that multitude had manifested in their earthly life (*εὑρέθη*, aor.); viz., perfect truthfulness never clouded by a lie. The expression *ψεῦδος*[4] is to be taken in its general sense, and not to be limited to the lies of idolatry,[5] heresy, or denial of Christ.[6] A contrast is easily conceivable to the sphere of falsehood in which the seducing false prophet[7] moves, with the worshippers of the beast accepting his lies.[8] Cf. also, in ix. 22, in an enumeration of the characteristic sins of the inhabitants of the earth, the juxtaposition of *πορνεία* and *κλέμματα*.[9] — *ἄμωμοι γάρ εἰσιν*. The conclusion which stands especially in analogous relation to the immediately preceding special point, as the *παρθ. γ. εἰσ.*, ver. 4, to the immediately preceding clause,[10] is, nevertheless, because of the comprehensive meaning of the predicate *ἄμωμοι*,[11] especially suitable for rounding the entire description (vv. 4, 5).

The purpose of the entire vision (vv. 1–5), in connection with ch. xiii., i.e., in contrast with what is there reported, is, as the exposition of the details proves, not that of showing how the *Church* abides in invincible glory opposed to the dragon,[12] or how in the midst of the corrupt Church (ch. xiii.)

accustomed to swear: *ἀκολουθεῖν τοῖς στρατηγοῖς ὅποι ποτ' ἂν ἄγωσιν* ["to follow the generals whithersoever they would go"]. Beng., De Wette, Hengstenb., Ebrard, Ew. ii.

[1] Cf. vii. 17.

[2] Augustine, l. c., but he is not consistent; Andr., Züll., Stern.

[3] Against De Wette, Hengstenb., who improperly appeal to Jas. i. 18, where the express designation *ἀπαρχ. τῶν αὐτοῦ κτισμάτων* is given; cf. also Jer. ii. 3.

[4] Cf. xxi. 27.

[5] Grot.: "They did not invoke the gods, which are not gods;" Beng.

[6] Cf. Hengstenb.

[7] xiii. 14.

[8] Cf. Ewald, Ebrard.

[9] Cf., besides, 1 Thess. iv. 4 sq., and ver. 6.

[10] See above.

[11] Cf. Eph. i. 4, v. 27; Col. i. 22.

[12] Primas, Beda: "The Church, rejoicing in her usual glory and number, encouraged for the conquest of the burdens of her oppression, with sublime joy of contemplation, celebrates at once, both with joy and invitation the conflicts of her King." Cf. Calov., C. a Lap., etc.

the true Church still continues,[1] or how the Lamb with his hosts stands ready to help by the side of the oppressed Church;[2] but[3] the manifestation of the blessed with the Lamb in eternal glory is intended to give believers who are on earth, and exposed to persecution on the part of the dragon, a pledge inspiring courage and patience (cf. ver. 11), that if they remain faithful they shall also attain to that glory.

In every respect preposterous are the historical explanations in Coccejus,[4] Vitr.,[5] etc., according to which, especially, the one hundred and forty-four thousand are regarded as the Waldenses. — Christiani has interpreted the one hundred and forty-four thousand even as the woman preserved in the wilderness,[6] and thus as the Church of the last times. The final Israelitic church is also understood[7] by Luthardt.

Vv. 6–20. Two visions, whose beginning in each case is marked by the formula *καὶ εἶδον* (vv. 6, 14), bringing the declarations of the judgment upon the world paying homage to the beast (ch. xiii.), stand therefore in inner connection with the vision (vv. 1-5), because they serve in their way for the encouragement of believers oppressed by the beast and his worshippers. The first vision (vv. 6–13). The first vision is concluded with an express reference to the foundation of the patience for believers lying here (ver. 12), since a heavenly voice proclaims a glorious promise for those who are faithful, and expressly enjoins that John should write down this assurance that is so important (ver. 13).

Ver. 6 sq. *ἄλλον ἀγγ.*, as x. 1, in distinction from those that appeared in former scenes. Against the idea and phraseology of the Apoc., Hilgenf.[8] refers the *ἄλλον ἀγγ.* to the Messiah, designated in ver. 1, whom he regards the first with respect to the angel here mentioned (vv. 6, 8, 9). — *πετόμενον ἐν μεσουρανήματι.* Like the eagle which (viii. 13) flies in the zenith, this angel is to reach the whole earth with its cry. — *ἔχοντα.* Cf. x. 2, i. 16. — *εὐαγγέλιον αἰώνιον.* As the article is lacking, the gospel of God's eternal counsel of salvation cannot be meant.[9] Too generally, and missing the idea *αἰώνιον*, C. a Lap. also explains: A message which promises eternal blessings in heaven. This reference De Wette combines, without proper clearness, with that which is alone correct, to the decree of God from eternity with respect to the things proclaimed in the gospel which the angel has. It is not, however, the summons to repentance sounded forth in ver. 7, that forms the contents of the message, which is a gospel because of a term being afforded even enemies for repentance;[10] but the authentic explanation is to be derived from x. 7,[11] where by the same expression (*εὐηγγέλισε*) reference is

[1] Vitr.

[2] Ewald: "The Messiah with his select saints prepared for war."

[3] vii. 9 sqq.

[4] Ver. 4: Voices against the worship of images, as the Council of Frankfort in the year 800, and other protests against papal errors.

[5] The players on the harp are Wiclif, Hus, etc. The *ᾠδ. καιν.*, ver. 3, is a confession of *seemingly* new contents, viz., the evangelical confession of the Bohemian brethren.

[6] xii. 14.

[7] Cf. vii. 4 sqq.

[8] p. 438.

[9] This is the same as the opinion of the old Protestant expositors, who understand, by the angel, Luther. See also Ebrard.

[10] Hengstenb.; cf. against him, Ebrard.

[11] Cf. Züll.

made directly to the eternal counsel of God, with respect to the glorious end at the coming of the Lord. As all patience and victorious fidelity of believers depend upon this message, it also contains the ground for the succeeding call to repentance in ver. 7. — *εὐαγγελίσαι ἐπὶ τοὺς καθημένους, κ.τ.λ.* The infin., which explains the idea *εὐαγγέλιον*, is in its formal dependence upon *ἔχοντα* to be explained indeed from expressions like Luke xii. 50, vii. 40, John xvi. 12:[1] yet the distinction is to be observed, that in this passage the *εὐαγγ. αἰών.* appears chiefly as the visible object which the angel has (*ἔχ.*, see above) in his hand — possibly in the form of a little book.[2] The *ἐπὶ* with the acc. following *εὐαγγελίσαι*, which does not occur elsewhere in such combination, has a meaning analogous to that of the *ἐπί* with the dative occurring with *προφητεῦσαι*. Not without violence is Ewald's explanation: "Above — because the angel flies above all lands." — To the dwellers on earth goes forth the *evangelical* message of the angel in the same sense as in x. 11, the *προφητεῦσαι* of John, which has indeed also an evangelical import (x. 7). [See Note LXXVI., p. 000.] To the ungodly dwellers on earth, there proceeds from the message which is to all believers, a true *εὐαγγέλιον*, but threatens the Lord's enemies with his coming to judgment, the strongest admonition to repentance. In ver. 7, therefore, there follows: *φοβήθητε τὸν θεὸν καὶ δότε αὐτῷ δόξαν*,[3] with the express emphasis of the reason just indicated: *ὅτι ἦλθεν, κ.τ.λ.*[4] — *καὶ προσκυνήσατε τῷ ποιήσαντι, κ.τ.λ.* They are to worship, not the beast, but Him who has manifested himself by his work of creation as the sole true God and Lord of the world, who also will punish his despisers.[5]

Ver. 8. It is a characteristic of the dramatic vividness of the scene, that every new point, which is to be proclaimed, is committed to a special angel.[6] The angel now coming forward is distinguished by the compound formula *ἄλλος δεύτερος* from the *ἄλλος ἄγγ.* mentioned in ver. 6.[7] — *ἔπεσεν, ἔπεσεν Βαβυλὼν ἡ μεγάλη.* The cry,[8] in a prophetical way, represents the sure and near impending judgment as already fulfilled.[9] The name of the O. T. secular power is transferred to that of the N. T.,[10] i.e., to Rome,[11] by not only indicating by means of this name its ungodly nature,[12] but also by the adjective *ἡ μεγάλη*, especially emphasizing how extent and fulness of power[13] are powerless for the protection of the vain foundation of self-assertion[14] from complete overthrow.[15] — *ἢ ἐκ τοῦ οἴνου, κ.τ.λ.* As in the ancient prophets, alongside of the threatenings of punishment, the precise charges on which those threats rest are generally presented, so also here the guilt of great Babylon is established. The view portrayed in xvii. 2, 4, xviii. 3, lies here already at the foundation. Babylon-Rome appears as a harlot who has seduced all the dwellers on earth to commit fornication with her: "*She made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication.*" The expression in xviii. 3

[1] De Wette.
[2] x. 2.
[3] Cf. xi. 13.
[4] Cf. xi. 18, vi. 7.
[5] Cf. iv. 11; Isa. xl. 12 sqq., xli. 1 sqq.
[6] "Quot res nunciandæ, totidem nuncii" (Grot.).
[7] Cf. examples in Wetst.
[8] xviii. 2; Isa. xxi. 9; cf. Jer. l. 2, li. 8.
[9] Cf. xi. 18.
[10] xiii. 1 sqq., xviii. 10.
[11] So remarks on ch. xiii. 17.
[12] Cf. xi. 8.
[13] Cf. xiii. 2, 4.
[14] Dan. iv. 27.
[15] Kliefoth understands "the metropolis of the last heathen secular power."

is incorrectly explained, if the θυμοῦ be regarded otherwise than in the firmly established sense of "*wrath*," ver. 10.[1] According to the linguistic usage of the Apoc., it is the glow and rage of *wrath*,[2] and not any other passion, which is designated by θυμός. But it is impossible to seek this wrath in the harlot Babylon herself, and then to understand the πορνεία of cunning arts, dissembling love, with which wrathful Babylon destroys the nations.[3] With perfect correctness, De Wette says that the entire expression depends upon a combination of two ideas: the wine of fornication,[4] wherewith Babylon has intoxicated the nations, is at the same time characterized as a οἶνος τοῦ θυμοῦ (viz., of the Divine wrath), and it is, consequently, represented[5] how the wine offered by the harlot Babylon to the nations, with which she has intoxicated them and led them to fornication with her, is also a wine which, because of the Divine wrath, has caused that drunkenness in the nations. It is analogous to what is instructively said in Rom. i. 21. The πορνεία is the idolatry practised with great Babylon, the all-ruling secular power.[6]

Vv. 9–11. That the wine of fornication is at the same time a wine of Divine wrath (ver. 8), follows from the message of the third angel, inasmuch as this expressly announces to the worshippers of the beast the impending Divine retribution: καὶ αὐτὸς πίεται ἐκ τοῦ οἴνου τοῦ θυμοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, κ.τ.λ., for the words εἴ τις προσκυνεῖ, κ.τ.λ., describe, according to the measure of ch. xiii.,[7] the meaning of the figurative expression πορνεία, ver. 8.

Ver. 10. The καὶ αὐτός[8] represents the details, as well as likewise the harlot herself, incurring the judgment.[9] — πίεται (fut.). Winer, p. 84. — The οἶνος τοῦ θυμοῦ τ. θ. is represented in the ποτήριον τῆς ὀργῆς αὐτου; but the dreadful power of this wine of wrath is rendered conspicuous, since it is itself designated: τοῦ κεκερασμένου ἀκράτου. It is meant that in the cup of indignation there is found unmixed wine (ἄκρατος, Ps. lxxiv. 9, LXX.), i.e., not tempered with water, and hence that the wine of wrath, thus set forth, works with its entire force. The contradiction in the words occurring in the connection of κεκερασμ. and ἀκράτ. is without difficulty, because[10] the custom of adapting the wine for ordinary use, by mixing it with water, has brought with it a usage of words in which the κεράν, without giving prominence to its special signification, attains the further sense of ἐγχέειν εἰς κέρας, διδόναι πιεῖν, etc.[11] So Ewald: "I have drunken wine so prepared (mixed) as to be pure;" De Wette, Ebrard, etc. According to Züll., the ἀκράτου is regarded not as undiluted *wine*, but as designating the "compounded," i.e.,

[1] Against Wetst., Grot., who make θυμ., "poison;" cf. also Eichh.; and against Ewald, Züll.: "Burning wine, intoxicating wine."

[2] xvi. 19, xix. 15. Cf. xv. 7, xvi. 1; also xiii. 2.

[3] Hengstenb.

[4] Cf. xvii. 2, 4; Jer. li. 7.

[5] Cf. Jer. xxv. 15 sqq., xxvii. sqq.

[6] Ver. 9, xiii. 4, 12. Grot., Ew., De Wette, etc.

[7] It really makes no difference that in xiii. 16 the ἐπὶ τ. χειρ. precedes, and in this passage the ἐπὶ τ. μετώπ. But with respect to change of case (cf. Winer, p. 382), it cannot be disregarded that in both places (cf. also xiii. 1) the genitive precedes. Cf. vii. 1, where, however, a modification of the idea is recognizable in ἐπὶ τῆς γ., τῆς θ. (on the earth, the sea) and ἐπί τι δένδρον (on any tree, against any tree). The accus. occurs twice, xx. 4.

[8] Cf. ver. 17.

[9] Cf. Ewald.

[10] Cf. Wetst.

[11] xviii. 6.

with additions, as spices, myrrh, opiates, etc., whereby the Orientals make their wine still stronger; and thus it is indicated that the Divine cup of indignation contains no wine but a pure mixture, "pure essence of mixtures." Hengstenb. interprets artificially, in a still different way. — *καὶ βασανισθήσονται.* Cf. ix. 5. The punishment of hell here described (*ἐν πυρὶ κ. θείῳ*, ix. 17, xx. 10) is not, with Grotius, to be resolved into pangs of conscience. — *ἐνώπιον τῶν ἁγίων ἀγγ. κ. ἐν τ. ἀρνίον.* Incorrectly, De Wette: According to the judgment. Rather, they suffer this their pain before the eyes of the holy angels, and of the Lamb despised and persecuted by the worshippers of the beast, which appears just on this account to render it the more bitter.[1] — *καὶ ὁ καπνὸς τοῦ βασανισμοῦ αὐτῶν, κ.τ.λ* , according to Isa. xxxiv. 10. Cf. xix. 3. It is to be observed, that in this passage *βασανισμός* is passive, in the sense of *βάσανος*. Cf., on the other hand, ix. 5. — *οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἀνάπαυσιν, κ.τ.λ.*, viz., in their *βασανισμός*.[2] The expression as iv. 8. — *καὶ εἴ τις λαμβ.* With grave emphasis this expression, individualizing the general conception, *οἱ προσκυνοῦντες*, affirms that every one who in any way resigns himself to the beast[3] incurs that eternal torment.

Ver. 12. Here where the declaration of the judgment impending the worshippers of the beast occurs so definitely and solemnly (vv. 6–11), the encouraging reference to the sources opened thereby to believers for the patience required of them (*ἡ ὑπομ.*) is still easier than in a similar connection, xiii. 10. — *οἱ τηροῦντες.* The construction is formless, as i. 5, ii. 20. On the thought, cf. xii. 17, iii. 10. *τὴν πίστιν Ἰησοῦ.* "The faith in Jesus." This, in fact, is parallel with the *μαρτυρία Ἰησοῦ*, xii. 17, because faith on him (Ἰησ., gen. obj.) depends upon the testimony proceeding from Jesus (Ἰησ., gen. subj.).

Ver. 13. A heavenly voice,[4] concerning which it is in no way said to what person it belongs,[5] commands John to write down what was itself just proclaimed as a word of revelation of his spirit (viz., *Μακάρ. — μετ' αὐτῶν*), because[6] this word of revelation contains the most effectual consolation for believers who are oppressed by the secular power, and even threatened with death.[7] Züll. is wrong in considering that there are two voices, for the voice of the Spirit (*ναὶ, λεγ. τ. πν., ἵνα, κ.τ.λ.*) is distinguished here as little from the "voice from heaven," as in the epistles, chs. ii. and iii., what the Spirit says is to be distinguished from what the Lord commands to be written. The voice from heaven belongs to a heavenly person, who, as interpreter of the Spirit, communicates his revelation to the prophet in intelligible words. The first sentence, which concludes with *ἀπ' ἄρτι*, contains what is properly the main point of the consolatory declaration, and, as it were, the theme, whose meaning (*μακάριοι*) is more fully explained in the following sentence. Not only by the formal plan, but also in a still more inward way, is this latter part of the heavenly discourse to be distinguished from the former; the *ναὶ* already shows us the beginning of a new

[1] Cf. xi. 12; Luke xvi. 23 sqq. Hengstenb.
[2] xx. 10.
[3] De Wette.
[4] x. 4.
[5] Against Hengstenb., who wants to refer it to a departed saint, or one of the elders.
[6] Cf. xix. 9, xxi. 5.
[7] Cf. xiii. 7, x. 16.

declaration, and a new declaration is also actually presented, since — as the parenthetical words *λέγει τὸ πνεῦμα* affirm — this confirmation and exposition (*ναὶ — ἵνα ἀναπαήσονται, κ.τ.λ.*), added to the first words *Μακάριοι — ἀπ' ἄρτι*, appear in a definite way as a revelation of the Spirit. It is, therefore, incorrect to refer the *ἀπ' ἄρτι* to the latter sentence, whether in the sense of Vitr., who combines the *ἀπ' ἄρτι* with *ἀναπαήσ.*, or in that of Lamb., Bos., who[1] writes *ἀπαρτί* (i.e., *ἀπηρτισμένως*), and tries to explain the wonderfully composed formula of assurance *ἀπαρτὶ ναί* by the absolute *plane profecto*.[2] The reference of the *ἀπ' ἄρτι*[3] to the emphatically prefixed conception of *μακάριοι* is shown by the relation of the thought.[4] By a combination with *ἀποθνήσκ.*, Züll. reaches the incorrect interpretation: "Better on this account than those who experience the impending time of distress, are the martyrs dying just at the beginning of this time;"[5] but the conception *μακάριοι* means much more and differently from what Züll. expresses, and to refer it alone to martyrs is as certainly incorrect as *ἀποθνήσκειν ἐν κυρίῳ* is not "to die for the sake of the Lord."[6] — The dead "who die[7] *in the Lord*," i.e., bound with him by faith, and kept in fellowship with him[8] by fidelity to the faith even unto death,[9] are "blessed from henceforth," because, viz., now the glorious end, which will bring condemnation to enemies[10] and complete blessedness to all believers,[11] immediately impends. This is the eschatological reference of the *ἀπ' ἄρτι*[12] presented in the connection, in its combination with the idea *μακάριοι*, which in itself points already to the goal of the Christian hope. — Incorrect is the explanation of Stern, who, in uncertainty, refers the *απ' ἄρτι* to the entire sentence *μακάρ. — ἀποθν.*, and incorrectly tries to apply what is said only of the end of time in such sense that then they who die in Christ immediately enter paradise — with intermission of purgatory, which is, therefore, indirectly fixed for the dying prior to that final time; while just as incorrectly, in order to escape the doctrine of purgatory, Calov., etc., explain the *ἀπ' ἄρτι* by "from the death of every one." [See Note LXXVII., p. 405.] *ἵνα ἀναπαήσονται ἐκ τῶν κόπων αὐτῶν.* The future is formed from *ἀναπαύω*, just as *κατακαήσομαι* from *κατακαίω*.[13] The *ἵνα* here can depend as little upon the parenthetical *λέγει τ. πν.*[14] as the *ἵνα* in 2 Cor. viii. 7 upon the succeeding *λέγω*. But this passage is not, with Ewald and De Wette, to be explained from 2 Cor. (above cited) and Eph. v. 33, as an idea lying at the foundation of a purposive command; but the close analogy of xxii. 14 shows that the clause *ἵνα, κ.τ λ.*, is to be elucidated after the manner of the restrictive idea of *μακάριοι*,[15] that it is expressed at the same time how the goal of

[1] *Exercit. phil. Francq.*, 1713, p. 299 sq.

[2] i.e., with unconditional certainty.

[3] Matt. xxvi. 64; John i. 52.

[4] Beda, C. a Lap., Calov., Wolf, Ew., De Wette, Hengstenb., Ebrard.

[5] Isa. lvii. 1. Cf. Coccejus: "The time is impending, in which it will be better to die than to live." Hammond.

[6] Also against Grot., Laun., Vitr., etc.

[7] The part. pres. marks the words *οἱ ἐν κυρ. ἀποθν.* in relation to the idea *οἱ νεκροί* (Züll., incorrectly: "Those exposed to death"), as a designation given more accurately than in a mode having no regard to time.

[8] 1 Cor. xv. 18; 1 Thess. iv. 16.

[9] ii. 10.

[10] vi. 10, viii. 3 sqq.

[11] vii. 9 sqq., xi. 16 sqq., xiv. 1 sqq., xxi. 1 sqq.

[12] Cf. Matt. xxvi. 64.

[13] Winer, p. 83. [14] Ebrard.

[15] (Hengstenb.) Not *αποθν.*, as Winer, p. 297, attempts, who by the partic. understands the temp. fin. *ἀποθνήσκουσι.*

blessedness (*μακάρ.*), held forth by the promise, includes that heavenly *ἀνάπαυσις*, and is to be afforded those dying in the Lord.[1] The solemn expression[2] which designates the blessed rest from all troubles of the earthly life of conflict[3] is the more significant, because it sets forth a peculiar opposition to the lot of the damned, ver. 11. — *τὰ δὲ ἔργα αὐτῶν ἀκολουθεῖ μετ' αὐτῶν.* The *δὲ* marks excellently the contrast between the just-mentioned *ἀνάπαυσις ἐκ τῶν κόπων* and the *ἔργα*, to which the *κόποι* themselves belong.[4] This significant contrast becomes uncertain if the idea of the "works"[5] be resolved into that of the reward itself.[6] The thought, which occurs in like manner both in the classics and in the rabbins,[7] is the profound view that the works wrought by believers in the Lord (1 Cor. xv. 58) are themselves an eternal good.

The entire section, vv. 6–13, Hammond refers to the times from Domitian to Constantine. — The old Lutheran exposition[8] understood by the angel with the eternal gospel, Luther. Such an interpretation was made already by Michael Stifel, in the year 1522. Bugenhagen took ver. 6 sqq. as the text for his funeral sermon on Luther.[9] A Catholic compositor, who was engaged in setting up the Lutheran Bible, Wittenberg, 1623, committed great offence by substituting "*neu*" (new) for "*ewig*" (*everlasting*).[10] Calov. understood by the angel (ver. 8), the second Martin, viz., Chemnitz with his *Examen Trid. Conc.* (*ἔπεσεν Βαβ.*); by the angel (ver. 9), the antagonists of the Calixtines, among whom he reckons also himself. — Bengel preferred to refer the angel (ver. 6) to John Arnd; the *μεσουράνημα* is — Germany. The angel (ver. 8) is probably Spener.

Vv. 14–20. After the paracletic episode (ver. 12 sq.), there follow again, in a new vision (ver. 14: *καὶ εἶδον καὶ ἰδού*, cf. ver. 1), symbolical declarations of the judgment now impending over the earth.[11] Cf. ver. 6 sqq.

Vv. 14–16. In the first picture of the ripeness of the earth for judgment,[12] it is the coming Judge himself who appears on a white cloud, with a sharp sickle in his hand. It is of like significance, when, from the first of the seals,[13] the victorious form of the Lord himself proceeds. — The description (ver. 14) allows us to think only of Christ himself,[14] but could not mean an angel,[15] who possibly represented Christ,[16] or "the heroes and chiefs who, armed with zeal for the truth, plead the cause of the Church, and executed the judgments of God."[17] Decisive is the solemn designation *ὅμοιον υἱῷ ἀνθρώπου*;[18] also the appearance on the cloud,[19] and the golden crown indicating a

[1] Cf. ix. 20.

[2] Cf. Heb. iv. 9: *κατάπαυσις*.

[3] κοπ., ii. 3. Cf. xxi. 4. [4] ii. 2.

[5] Cf. ii. 5, 19, iii. 8.

[6] De Wette; cf. Grot.: "The memory of deeds."

[7] Sophael., *Philact.*, 1420: *ἀθάνατον ἀρετήν* ["Immortal virtue"]; v. 1443: *οὐ γὰρ ἡ εὐσέβεια συνθνήσκει βροτοῖς* ["Piety does not die with mortals"]. Aboth., vi. 9: "At the hour of man's departure, gold and silver do not accompany him, but the law and good works."

[8] "Almost all of our writers" (Wolf). Cf. also Vitr.

[9] Cf. Bengel, *Erkl. Off.*, p. 758.

[10] Cf. Wolf on ver. 6.

[11] Doing homage to the beast, ch. xiii.

[12] Joel iv. 13. Cf. Knobel, *Proph.*, I. 369 sqq.

[13] vi. 2.

[14] Beda, Andr., Eichh., Calov., Ew. i., Hengstenb., Ebrard, Volkm.

[15] Grot., Vitr., Beng., Züll., De Wette.

[16] Grot., De Wette, Ew. ii.

[17] Vitr.

[18] Cf. i. 13; Dan. vii. 13.

[19] Cf. i. 7; Dan., l. c.

special glory as victor,[1] make the reference to Christ himself still more certain. The expression *ἄλλος ἀγγ.* (ver. 15), besides, does not compel us here[2] to understand an angel also in ver. 14, because the *ἄλλος* alludes to the angels mentioned in ver. 6 sqq.,[3] and the objection that Christ himself could not have received a command[4] from an angel, is settled by the fact that the angel is only the bearer of the command coming from God.[5] See, also, on ver. 17 — *καθήμενον.* The accus., as iv. 4. — *ἔχων.* Cf. ver. 12, ver. 7, x 2. — *δρέπ. ὀξύ.* Therefore serviceable for use in such a way that this sickle allows nothing to stand which is ripe for cutting. — *ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ*, ver. 15, cf. xi. 19. The angel appears as one immediately sent from God. *πέμψον*, cf. Joel iv. 13; Mark iv. 29. The expression is here especially significant, because the idea is presented that the sickle thrust forth on the earth (ver. 16) is to cut down there. — *ἡ ὥρα θερίσαι* construed as ix. 10, xi. 16. — *ἐξηράνθη.* The sign of the ripeness, since the figure of a field of corn is here[6] presented. — *ὁ θερισμὸς τῆς γῆς.* The authentic explanation follows (ver. 16): *ἐθερίσθη ἡ γῆ.* The whole earth is the harvest-field; the ripe stalks are those *καθήμενοι ἐπι τ. γ.*, ver. 6.

Vv. 17-20. Another angel,[7] likewise coming from the heavenly temple, and therefore from God himself, intrusted with a work symbolizing the final judgment, has, as one like the Son of man (ver. 14), a sharp sickle, by which the ripened clusters in the vineyard of the earth are to be harvested. Not only does this occur at the command brought again by another angel, but the clusters are also pressed.

καὶ αὐτός. The formula[8] marks only that the same thing is said by this person as by the person designated in ver. 14; but in other respects the persons are by no means "put on the same level,"[9] so that it does not follow from ver. 17 that the one like the Son of man is an angel. Still less, however, can it be inferred to the contrary, from ver. 14, that the *ἄγγελος* (ver. 17) is not an angel, but the Lord himself.[10] — The other angel (ver. 18), who brings to the one mentioned in ver. 17 the command for harvesting the vineyard of the earth, is in a twofold respect significantly characterized, according to his place of starting: *ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου*, and according to his peculiar power: *ὁ ἔχων ἐξουσίαν ἐπὶ τοῦ πυρός.* He came forth "out of the altar."[11] This idea is derived from the *ἐκ*, which is to be rendered here "from,"[12] as little as the *ἀπό* in ix. 13. Its meaning is to be derived from the description (viii. 3 sqq.),[13] in connection with the designation of the *ἐξουσία* which the angel has over fire.[14] The same altar beneath which the souls of the martyrs lie, crying for vengeance, and from which not only the fire is taken which, cast upon the earth, gives the signal in general for the trumpet-visions announcing the beginning of the vengeance, but whence, also, in the sixth trumpet-vision especially, the voice sounds that calls forth a de-

[1] Cf. vi. 2, xix. 12.
[2] Cf., on the contrary, x. 1, vii. 2.
[3] In ver. 6. also, the ἄλλος does not have its reference in what immediately precedes.
[4] Ver. 15: Πέμψον, κ.τ.λ.
[5] Cf. Mark xiii. 32.
[6] Cf., on the other hand, ver. 18 sqq.
[7] Cf. ver. 15.
[8] Cf. ver. 10.
[9] De Wette.
[10] Against Hengstenb.
[11] Mentioned in viii. 3 sqq., xvi. 7.
[12] Ew. i., De Wette, Ebrard.
[13] Cf. vi. 9, ix. 13, xvi. 7.
[14] *ἐπὶ τ. πυρ.*, as xi. 6; cf. vi. 8.

structive army upon the earth, appears significantly in this passage as the proper *place* of an angel who transmits the command for the execution of judgment, and who, since he has power over fire,[1] manifests himself as one whose sending brings an answer to the prayers of the martyrs, and thus, by his entire manner and appearance, recalls the blood-guilt of the enemies whose blood is now to cover the earth (ver. 20). — *τρύγησον*. Luke vi. 44. — *καὶ ἔβαλεν*, *κ.τ.λ.*, ver. 19. Cf. ver. 16. Here, however, the figure is not limited to the mere cutting-off of the clusters, but the pressing also follows: *καὶ ἔβαλεν εἰς τὴν ληνὸν τ. θυμ. τ. θ. τὸν μέγαν*. In reference to the remarkable combination of the masc. *τὸν μεγ.* with the fem. *τὴν λην.*,[2] cf. Winer, p. 490, who explains the masc. by the fact that *ὁ λην.* also occurs. But a reason why this change of the gen. has happened is scarcely to be found. At all events, Prov. xviii. 14 should be recalled, where the word רוּחַ occurs first as masc. because the spirit appears in more forcible activity, and afterwards as fem., because, since it suffers from disease, it is represented in feminine weakness. So, too, the masc. *τόν μέγ.* could be attached to the ordinary feminine form *τὴν λην.*, because this form appears appropriate to the representation of the wrath of God as active in the pressing. — *καὶ ἐπατήθη ἡ λην.* The standing expression: cf. Joel iv. 13; Isa. lxiii. 2 sq. — *ἔξωθεν τῆς πόλεως*. "The city," without further designation, cannot be Rome,[3] but only Jerusalem; yet not the heavenly Jerusalem,[4] also not Jerusalem so far as the holy city represents the Church,[5] but the real, earthly Jerusalem, against which, as is stated in xx. 9, the hosts of the world rush, but will be annihilated there before the holy city.[6] Incorrectly, Grotius: "This did not occur in the city, because there were no Jews there."[7] — *αἷμα*. In Isa. lxiii. 3, LXX., the blood is also expressly mentioned, which is properly meant by the figure of the juice of grapes. — *ἄχρι τῶν χαλινῶν τῶν ἵππων*, *κ.τ.λ.* How fearful the bloodshed is, is illustrated by designating it as a stream of blood which is so deep as to reach to the reins of the horses wading therein, while its extent is given as sixteen hundred furlongs.[8] In this sense, the first expression, *ἀχρι τ. χαλ. τ. ἵππ.*, is understood by almost all expositors;[9] but the reference to the extent of the stream of blood is not without difficulty. Passing by purely arbitrary explanations,[10] only two possibilities are offered: either the designation of

[1] Viz., of that altar; cf. Grot., Vitr., Ewald; but not over fire in general (cf. xvi. 5), for this general reference is here entirely out of place.

[2] The MSS. allow neither *τὸν λην.* — *τὸν μέγ.*, nor *τὴν λην.* — *τὴν μεγ.* *ἡ λην.* occurs also in ver. 20, xix. 15. Lücke (*Einl.*, II., p. 464) regards it possible, even though very harsh, for *τον μέγαν*, by a construction according to the sense, to refer to *τοῦ θυμοῦ τ. θ.*, and to have the meaning of *τοῦ μεγάλου*. Yet he also recurs to Winer's explanation.

[3] Hammond, Wetst., Calov., Hilgenf., Kienlen, etc.

[4] Beda, Marlorat., who recall that the lost shall suffer pain outside of heaven, viz., in hell.

[5] Hengstenb.: "It is declared that not the members of the Church, but the world outside the Church, shall be judged."

[6] Cf. Eichh., Züll., Ew., De Wette, etc.

[7] Cf. the close of the verse.

[8] On the *ἀπὸ* before *σταδ.*, cf. Meyer on John xi. 18.

[9] Nevertheless, many of the older commentators have allegorized also here. Thus Victorin. found it indicated that also "the princes," Beda that even the devil, would not be exempt. Hengstenb., incorrectly, brings in the horsemen of xix. 14. Cf. Ebrard.

[10] e.g., Wetst., who referred it to the vastness of Otho's camp on the Po.

the measure must be regarded as schematical, whether it depend upon the adoption of an hyperbole not to be urged with respect to details,[1] or the number four[2] be considered as a root, and then the number 1,600 reduced to $4 \times 4 \times 100$,[3] or 40×40,[4] or 4×400,[5] be taken in the sense which Victorin.[6] and Beda already have; or the sixteen hundred furlongs must be understood accurately and properly, so that the length of Palestine is designated, — according to the statement of Jerome, who[7] says: "From Dan to Beersheba, which is extended scarcely to the distance of clx. miles." In accordance with this are the explanations not only of Eichh., Heinr., Züll., Ewald, etc., who[8] maintained that the scene of ver. 20 is in the Holy Land, but also of C. a Lap, etc., who understand by the Holy Land the Church; and of Grot. and Beng., who, in a different respect, wanted to reach the meaning that the bloodshed occurred even beyond the boundaries of Palestine.[9] But the entire explanation, based upon the statement of Jerome, is hardly tenable, because, if John had wished, by means of a geographical designation of length, to refer to the Holy Land, the number must have been accurate. But this is not the case; for, as a Roman mile contained eight furlongs,[10] the one hundred and sixty Roman miles of Jerome would correspond to twelve hundred and eighty, but not to sixteen hundred stadia.[11] It is highly probable, therefore, that the schematic number, which is intended to represent the vast extent of the stream of blood proceeding from the horns of the altar, has grown in a similar way from the number four, which refers to all four ends of the earth,[12] to that in which, in vii. 4, xiv. 1, the number one hundred and forty-four thousand has been developed from the holy radical twelve.

In the systematic connection of the entire Apocalyptic development, the vision (vv. 14–20) has the same relation to the express description of the actual final judgment (ch. xvii. sqq.), as the sixth seal-vision (vi. 12 sqq.) has already to the fulfilment of the mystery of God,[13] which does not occur until in the seventh seal. Both the sense and the expression[14] show that the judgment portrayed in ver. 14 sqq. is the final judgment itself; this is indicated also by the appearance on the cloud of one like the Son of man

[1] Zeger.

[2] Cf. vii. 1.

[3] Hengstenb.

[4] Ebrard.

[5] Marlorat., Vitr., etc.

[6] "Throughout all the four parts of the world."

[7] *Ep. ad Dard. Opp.*, T. III., p. 46.

[8] Cf. the ἐξ τ. πόλεως.

[9] Grot. refers to the fact that Trajan put to death Jews in Syria, Egypt, etc.

[10] Cf. Winer, *Rwb.*, II. 588. Stadium.

[11] Another circumstance is, that the length of the Holy Land is not sixteen hundred stadia, i.e., forty German miles, but, as Jerome correctly says, scarcely one hundred and sixty Roman miles, i.e., thirty-two German miles. — Ew. ii., indeed, tries to find in the text only a large round number, by mentioning at the same time, that clusters of grapes appear, e.g., on coins, as a symbol of the Holy Land. But he errs in finding a devastation of the Holy Land here set forth, — while the subject has really to do with the inhabitants of the earth, whose place of execution, as in xx. 9, is outside the city, and, therefore, in the Holy Land, — and in urging the special reference of the "cluster of grapes" to the Holy Land; and thereby injures the parallelism between the "harvest," ver. 15 sqq., and the "wine harvest," ver. 18 sqq., which then affords only a more general significance.

[12] Cf. iv. 6.

[13] Cf. x. 7.

[14] Ver. 16: ἐθερίσθη; ver. 19: ἐτρύγησε, ἔβαλεν; ver. 20: ἐπατήθη.

(ver. 14), and therefore of the coming Judge himself, besides the special point in ver. 20 (ἐξ. τ. πολ.) comprised in the account of xx. 9. But, on the other hand, it is to be observed that a complete account of the catastrophe is not yet given; in what way the various enemies (the secular power, the false prophet, even the dragon himself) are judged, is not at all described here; add to this, that the manifestation of the Judge (vv. 14–17) does not at all correspond with what is to be expected according to i. 7,[1] and that immediately afterwards, in ver. 19 sqq., it is an angel, and not the Lord himself, who appears as executor of the vengeance. From all this, it is to be inferred that the vision (vv. 14–20)[2] brings, it is true, a preliminary representation of the final judgment, but, nevertheless, that the systematic introduction of the complete account is not disturbed; because of its proleptical character, the scheme of the prophetical development does not become apparent, and especially the actual end is not set before us in ver. 20, in the sense, as though by "recapitulating" in some way with xv. 1,[3] it were again retraced.[4]— Vitr. interprets vv. 14–20 of the judgment of the false (i.e., the Papal) Church.

Notes by the American Editor.

LXXV. Ver. 4. οἱ μετὰ γυναικῶν, κ.τ.λ.

Any interpretation of this passage that teaches a superior holiness and blessedness as belonging to the unmarried estate, or attaches any defilement to marriage, is inconsistent with Heb. xiii. 4. See this passage defended from such view at some length by Chemnitz already (*Examen Concilii Tridentini*, Schlawitz ed., 1861, p. 535). Hence all such attempts at mediation between maintaining the sanctity of marriage and the peculiar sanctity of celibacy, like those of Alford and Luthardt, are ineffectual. The former says: "In them that fountain of carnal desire has never been opened, which is so apt to be a channel for unholy thoughts, and an access for the tempter." [Cf., however, 1 Cor. vii. 2.] "The virgins may thus have missed the victory over the lusts of the flesh; but they have also, in great part, escaped the conflict. We are, perhaps, more like that which the Lord intended us to be; but they are more like the Lord himself." Luthardt proposes another mode of mediation, by affirming that no special holiness of celibacy is taught, but that under the peculiar circumstances of the last times it would be the duty of Christians to remain unmarried, and marriage intercourse would then be only a yielding to sinful lusts. Gebhardt, on the contrary: "They have, in the most marked contrast to the world, with its fornications, or idolatrous worship and service of sin, not defiled themselves with women; that is, in the strongest and fullest sense, they have not committed fornication, have not been unfaithful to God; they have not allowed themselves to be tempted by the world, and have not sinned, 'for they are virgins;' that is, what they are according to their nature as Christians, pure, holy, chaste, has, in their lives, simply perfected itself in gradual development, or, in the particular case, maintained itself. Certainly

[1] Cf. vi. 2, 12 sqq., xi. 15 sqq.
[2] Cf. also vv. 1–6.
[3] Cf. Introduction, p. 13 sq.
[4] Against Beda, etc.

many expositors take the words just explained in a peculiar sense, and determine the representation of the seer to be that perfect abstinence from sexual intercourse belongs to the distinguished sanctity of the one hundred and forty-four thousand, and that, on this account, they enjoy peculiar blessedness; which, as Köstlin observes, is not merely in the spirit of the O. T., but is Esseno-Ebionitish. The one hundred and forty-four thousand are neither distinguished Christians, nor do they enjoy peculiar happiness; even on this supposition, it would be wholly inconceivable that the seer should have imagined one hundred and forty-four thousand unmarried Christians, and, according to the literal sense, Christians of the male sex; still less would he have regarded as Christians only those who had not been married. . . . I find that John has spoken of the idolatry and the sin of the world as fornication with sufficient frequency, and strength, and clearness, to enable us to see in it the true interpretation of this imagery. The true sense more decidedly presents itself if we begin, not with the first, but with the second member of the sentence, — 'they are virgins,' — which is evidently symbolical."

LXXVI. Ver. 7. *εὐαγγέλιον αἰώνιον.*

Alford says briefly on Düsterdieck's interpretation: "I should have thought that such a rendering only needed mentioning to be repudiated. Ch. x. 7, which is adduced to justify it, is quite beside the purpose." Ebrard really anticipates every objection to the older interpretation here urged: "The older exegetes, together with Lücke, are probably right when they understand the contents of the message in general as the message of the salvation in Christ. 'An eternal message of joy' that is, indeed, which the angel here brings; he brings a message which is eternal as to its contents, and, therefore, is eternal also, according to its announcement, as since the foundation of the world there has been no other message of joy and salvation, and in eternity there will be no other. That the definite article does not stand here, is owing to the fact that the message is to be described, as it appears to the *ἔθνεσι, κ.τ.λ.*, viz., as one new to them. The angel has 'an eternal message of salvation to bring them.'" So also Gebhardt, who refers, besides, to the error of our author in conceiving of something being intended by this proclamation for the ungodly inhabitants of the earth, that is different from the real contents of the message. Gebhardt regards the angel only "an Apocalyptic art-device" to describe vividly "the publication of Christianity in ever-widening circles," which "is in reality accomplished by the apostles and other preachers," and coinciding in meaning with Matt. xxiv. 14.

LXXVII. Ver. 13. *ἀπ' ἄρτι.*

The interpretation referred to is not peculiar to Calov. and the school of exegetes which he represents; e.g., Ebrard: "*ἀπ' ἄρτι μακάριοι εἰσι* says rather simply this (De Wette, etc.), that they who die in Christ need not wait for blessedness and compensation until, by the return of Christ to earth, an end is made to the power of the beast hostile to Christ, but, that, immediately after their deaths, they shall find the most glorious compensation by resting from their labors, and not losing the fruit of their works accompanying them. Nothing whatever is said concerning any merit of their works before God as Judge; for they are the regenerate 'who die in the Lord,' because they have

lived in Him, and He in them." Hengstenberg: "The dead who die in the Lord are blessed from now on. This is not contrasted with any former time in which the dead who died in the Lord were not blessed. The blessedness is as old as the dying in the Lord, and this dates from the time of Christ's death, who also already, for the intermediate state, has brought life to light (2 Tim. i. 10), but with a remote future with respect to the completion of the kingdom of God; not first in the new Jerusalem that is hereafter to be established on the renewed earth, but already from the moment of their departure into heaven. This is explained by the conversation between Christ and the penitent thief. The latter prayed the Lord to remember him when he came into his kingdom at the establishment of the kingdom of glory on earth. But the Lord assured him of more than that for which he prayed (Luke xxiii. 43). By saying, '*Lord*, remember me,' the thief shows that he is one who is dying in the Lord. For to die in the Lord, is when one, in the face of death, with complete confidence confesses Him to be Lord." Luthardt: "It was expressly revealed to John, in order that Christians of all times may know that from now on, i.e., now already, blessed are they who die in the Lord, i.e., in fellowship with him, for with their death they enter into a blessed state; in order, also, that they may be consoled in that they die before the second coming of Christ. . . . This toilsome life is now at an end, and a blessed peaceful rest in the bosom of Christ follows, while the unblessed have no rest day or night (ver. 11)."

Observe the force of the ἐκ τῶν κοπῶν, as in note on ch. ii. 2. The promise ἀναπαήσονται belongs here only where there have been previously κόποι, viz., toilsome exhaustive labors, not for self, but for the Lord.

CHAPTER XV.

Ver. 2. *τοὺς νικῶντας.* So here (cf., on the other hand, ii. 7) Lach., Tisch. 1854 and IX. [W. and H.], in accordance with A, C, ℵ, Elz. Tisch. 1859 has *νικοῦντ.* adopted from C. The addition derived from xiii. 17, *ἐκ τοῦ χαράγματος αὐτοῦ* before *ἐν τ. ἀριθμ.* (Elz.), is certainly false. — Ver. 3. *τῶν ἐθνῶν.* So A, B, 2, 4, 6, al., Compl., Plant., Genev., Beng., Lach., Tisch. The variation *τ. αἰώνων* (cf. 1 Tim. i. 17) occurs in C, ℵ$_1$, 18, Vulg. (var.: *caelorum*) [adopted by W. and H.]. The rec. *τ. ἁγίων* is almost without any testimony. — Ver. 4. The *σε* after *φοβ.* (Elz., Beng.) is to be erased according to A, B, C (Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]). ℵ has it after *τίς.* The same testimonies require *δοξάσει*, instead of *δοξάσῃ* (ℵ, Elz.). — Ver. 6. *λιθον.* So A, C, Vulg., Ambrose, Beda, Andr., al., Lach. [W. and H.] The rec. *λινον* (Tisch.) seems to be a modification which occurs already in B (ℵ: *καθ. λινους*). — Ver. 8. *καπνοῦ.* B indeed has *ἐκ τοῦ κ.* (Tisch.), and the omission of *ἐκ του* was readily suggested; yet the mere *καπνοῦ* by itself (Elz., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]) is attested by A, C, ℵ, al.

In a new vision (ver. 1: *καὶ εἶδ. ἄλλο σημ.*)[1] seven angels are represented, who are to bring the last plagues determined by the wrath of God. After they who stand, as victors over the beast,[2] at God's throne, have celebrated the wonderful and righteous works and judgments of God, whose end is now to be introduced by the seven angels (vv. 2–4), these angels, coming into heaven from the opened temple, receive from one of the four beings (iv. 6 sqq.) seven vials full of the wrath of God, whose pouring-forth is then described in ch. xvi.

Ver. 1. *ἄλλο σημ.* The manifestations in ch. xiv., with which the present angelic manifestation is contrasted as an *ἄλλο σημ.*, were also apocalyptic signs. — *μέγα καὶ θαυμαστόν.* The greatness (xii. 1) and marvellousness lies not only in the fact that seven angels — not archangels[3] — appear at once, but also in their peculiar equipage: *ἔχοντας πληγὰς ἑπτά.* Manifestly John wishes, by this expression,[4] to say more than that they had a sign ("*signatur*") of the plagues to be brought by them, as that possibly their eyes shone like flames of fire;[5] the idea is, that they who have the *ἐξουσια* to bring the plagues described in ch. xvi.[6] *have* and hold these plagues themselves. In what way this is to be understood, is not said; it belongs to the *θαυμαστόν* of this vision. But it is worthy of notice with what beautiful, artistic transparency the declaration of the actual ordination of these plagues is communicated, in that (ver. 5 sqq.) the seven angels, who are described again

[1] Cf. xii. 1.
[2] Ch. xiii.
[3] Züll., Stern; cf. also De Wette.
[4] Cf. xvii. 6, vi. 5, x. 2.
[5] Hengstenb.
[6] Cf. xvi. 9, 21: *ἡ πληγή.*

also in ver. 6 as *οἱ ἔχοντες τ. ἑπτὰ πληγ.*, receive special vials, through the pouring-out of which the plagues can first be brought to plastic representation. — From ver. 5, where the *ναός* in heaven is opened, and then the seven angels proceed therefrom, Züll., De Wette, Ebrard, etc., correctly infer that in ver. 1 a point cannot be designated lying within the vision actually before ver. 5, as though John in ver. 1 had only first beheld the seven angels themselves, but in ver. 5 their coming forth from the *ναός*, etc.; rather in ver. 1, the chief subject of the entire vision extending to xvi. 21, yea in a certain way embracing the entire final development,[1] is first given preliminarily, while the more detailed account as to how the seven angels actually come forth follows then (ver. 5) after the heavenly hymn, vv. 2–4, — during which the angels are to be regarded as in the still closed *ναός*, — has praised beforehand the righteousness of the judgment to be executed by them; and then they themselves are certainly equipped for (ver. 7) their work, and directed (xvi. 1) to fulfil their calling. Cf. xii. 6 in its relation to xii. 13 sqq. — *τὰς ἐσχάτας*. Not "the last in this way,"[2] nor the last which a certain portion of the enemies has to endure,[3] but for the reason: *ὅτι ἐν αὐταῖς ἐτελέσθη ὁ θυμὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*.[4] This is misunderstood, however, by Hengstenb., who concludes that with vi. 21, where the seven plagues are at an end, the entire final judgment has been recounted, — as should have been the case also in xi. 19 and several times before, — and that then, with xvii. 1, a repetition of that final judgment occurs which renders prominent new sides. Yet not only the very number indicates a meaning analogous to that of the seven last plagues, as the plagues described in the seal- and trumpet-visions, which do *not* contain the final judgment itself, but have only introduced that immediately before which belongs in the seventh trumpet,[5] and consequently in the seventh seal;[6] but, in the sense of the Apoc., the judgment cannot occur at all under the conception of a plague, since, according to the description in ch. xvii. sqq., the judgment extends infinitely far over what is contained up to xvi. 21. The plagues described also in ch. xvi.,[7] not without a reference to those of Egypt,[8] have in themselves something preparatory to which the final action corresponds. As by the trumpet-plague the dwellers on earth are not brought to repentance,[9] so also neither are they by the vial-plagues.[10] The more certain and immediate, therefore, is the actual final judgment, whose description then also immediately follows that of the *last plagues*,[11] and to which, therefore, we are directed in the midst of the plagues as to something immediately impending.[12] The result of this is that the *fulfilment of the wrath of God* (*ἐτελέσθη*)[13] is to be understood only relatively; viz., in so far as it is manifested in the "plagues." No more plagues will come after the vial-plagues; but then the Lord himself will come to administer his final judgment.

[1] Cf. xvii. 1, xxi. 9.
[2] C. a Lap.
[3] Beng.: "After the fulfilment of the seven plagues, the holy wrath of God, therefore, against other enemies does not cease."
[4] So too, with formal correctness, Beng.
[5] x. 7.
[6] vi. 17, vii. 1, viii. 1.
[7] Cf. chs. vi., viii.; ix.
[8] Cf. also ver. 2 sqq.
[9] ix. 20 sqq.
[10] xvi. 21.
[11] xvii. 1 sqq.
[12] xvi. 15.
[13] Cf. x. 7.

Vv. 2–4. Before the beginning of the last plagues, immediately preceding the end itself, yea before the opening of the heavenly *νάος* (ver. 5), and accordingly even before the actual coming-forth of the seven angels,[1] a song is heard in heaven which proclaims the righteousness of the ways of God, now near their ultimate goal as worthy of adoration,[2] and whose sense declares that they who, standing by the sea of glass, raise this song of praise, are the victors over the beast. — *ὡς θάλασσαν ὑαλίνην μεμιγμένην πυρί.* Ebrard is wrong in understanding here a different sea of glass from that in iv. 6; for the article missed by Ebrard must be lacking, because by the expression *ὡς θαλ. ὑαλ.*, just as in iv. 6, it is chiefly to be indicated that not an actual sea of glass, but only something like a sea of glass, is designated. It is not until at the close of ver. 2, that, since by the first accurate expression recalling iv. 6, *ὡς θάλ. ὑαλ.*, an end is placed to all misunderstanding, it is expressly said, with a certain want of precision, *ἐπὶ τὴν θάλ. τὴν ὑαλ.* That the addition *μεμιγμένην πυρί* cannot be referred here to any thing else than in iv. 6, follows likewise from the close of ver. 2, which shows that the essential designation of what is meant lies in the words *θαλ. ὑαλιν.*, while the *μεμιγμ. πυρί* expresses a more special, although in this place a significant, side-reference. Because of the addition *μεμιγμ. πυρί*, the false interpretations of *ὡς θάλ. ὑαλίν.*, iv. 6, appear here in new applications. Grot. understands here "the mass of Gentile Christians inflamed with love to God;" Coccejus, "the peace of the world, and the operation of the Holy Spirit in the world;" Calov., who refers the *θάλ.* to baptism, and the *πῦρ* to God's wrath, interprets: "That grace will not be denied to penitents in the midst of the flames of Divine wrath;" Vitr. explains that the victors stand upon the firm ground of the truth illumined by the fire of Divine righteousness; the allusion to the lightning, iv. 5, Eichh. and De Wette interpret as meaning the atmosphere; Züll. and Ewald, the floor of heaven; while De Wette, Hengstenb., Ebrard, Stern,[3] maintain a reference to the Red Sea, at which the children of Israel sang their song of praise. But it is just this passage[4] which, because of its other contents, is adapted for furnishing the correct interpretation also for iv. 6. That which is like "a sea of glass," by which[5] the victors stand, designates, like the river of life,[6] the eternal fulness of joy in God's presence, with which the victors will be rewarded. But if, in this passage, the sea appears also as "*mingled with fire*," thereby the unity of God's saving grace and judging righteousness is designated in like manner; as already in the fundamental description of the glory of God, iv. 3 sqq.,[7] both points are harmoniously[8] presented, and, as in general in prophecy concerning the end, both parts of the subject belong together. — *τοὺς νικῶντας.*

[1] Cf. ver. 1.

[2] Cf. xi. 15 sqq.; also iv. 8, v. 8 sqq.

[3] Who recognizes in the *θαλ. ὑαλ. μεμ. πυρ.* a symbol of the antichristian persecution.

[4] Cf. xxii. 1.

[5] Beng., De Wette, etc. Cf. iii. 20, viii. 3. The explanation of the *ἐπί* by *super*, which is in itself unnatural, and does not harmonize with the scenery of iv. 6, coheres with the false allegorizing in Vitr., etc.

[6] xxii. 1 sqq.

[7] Cf. especially iv. 5.

[8] Out of harmony, and in violation of taste, Ew. thinks that by the mingling of sea and fire "an indescribable boiling foam, a fire-broth," originated.

The pres. part.[1] designates the idea without regard to time.[2] — *ἐκ τ. θηρ.* Winer, p. 345. On the subject, cf. xiii. 7, 15 sqq , xiv. 13. — *ἐχ. κιθάρας τοῦ θεοῦ.* Cf. v. 8, xiv. 2, 1 Chron. xvi. 42. The "*harps of God*" are such as serve only for the praise of God.[3] — The song is characterized as: *τὴν ᾠδὴν Μωϋσέως τοῦ δούλου τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὴν ᾠδὴν τοῦ ἀρνίου.* It is not two songs that are designated;[4] also no allusion whatever is made to the connection between prophecy and the gospel;[5] altogether false is every explanation that does not acknowledge that the song immediately following, introduced by the *λέγοντες*, is at the same time both the song of Moses[6] and the song of the Lamb. But this does not mean the song wherein these former idol-worshippers declare their conversion to Moses and Jesus, or rather to "the God of these,"[7] nor the song of Moses[8] applied to Christ and the things of Christ;[9] but the song which is composed alike by Moses and the Lamb, and is taught to the victors.[10] By this the same view is significantly expressed, which appears in another way also in x. 7, vii. 9 sqq., in combination with vii. 4 sqq. and xiv. 1; viz.,[11] that the essential unity of the O. and the N. T. Church, which collects its victorious members from Jews and Gentiles, is attested and represented in the most definite manner, — a view which is absolutely incompatible with the Judaism charged against the Apoc. by Baur, Volkm., etc. [See Note LXXVIII., p. 413.] The song has the O. T. psalm tone, as what is in clear accord with the O. T. manifests itself everywhere in the details.[12] In a more definite form the character of a song of the Lamb is not distinctly expressed; but in fact it is also such, because the *δικαιώματα* of God serve for the glory of the Lamb. — *Μεγάλα καὶ θαυμαστὰ, κ.τ.λ.* Cf. Ps. cxi. 2, cxxxix. 14; 1 Chron. xvi. 9. — *κύριε — παντοκράτωρ.* iv. 8, xi. 17. Cf. i. 8. — *δίκαιαι καὶ ἀληθιναὶ αἱ ὁδ. σ.* Ps. cxlv. 17; Deut. xxxii. 4.[13] — *ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν ἐθνῶν.* Jer. x. 7. From this passage originate also the following words,[14] and just in this way is the ascription of praise especially appropriate, because treating of the judgments on the Gentile world, which gives divine honor to the beast.[15] — *ὅτι, κ.τ.λ.* Of the three clauses introduced by the *ὅτι*, the first two are co-ordinated with each other, since the former in its way gives the basis for the interrogatory *τίς — τὸ ὄνομά σου*, and the last words *ὅτι τὰ δικαιώμ. σ. ἐφαν.* that for the immediately preceding clause *ὅτι πάντα, κ.τ.λ. — μόνος ὅσιος.* The variation *ἅγιος* arises from the classical linguistic prejudice, according to which the predicate *ὅσιος*, which in the N. T. is said only (xvi. 5) of God, is applied to godly men.[16] — Although the words

[1] Incorrectly, Eichh.: *νενικηκότας.*

[2] Cf. xiv. 13, ii. 7, 11, 17.

[3] Beng., etc.

[4] Against Andr., who refers the one to the O. T. saints, and other to the N. T. believers.

[5] Coccejus.

[6] Concerning whose formal designation as *τ. δούλ. τ. θ.*, cf. Exod. xiv. 31; Num. xii. 7; Jos. xiv. 7, xxii. 5. The LXX. do not have here the word *δοῦλος.*

[7] Züll.

[8] Exod. xv.

[9] Grot.; cf. Calov., Vitr., De Wette, Hengstenb., Ebrard.

[10] Cf. xiv. 3. Ew.

[11] Cf. also xii. 1, 17.

[12] Cf. Züll., De Wette.

[13] LXX.: *ἀληθινά* for תְּמִים. Cf., on the other hand, Rev. iii. 14.

[14] Only that *σε* after *φοβ.* does not belong to the correct text.

[15] Cf. xiii. 4.

[16] Cf. Schol. on Eurip., *Hecub.* 788: *τὸ πρὸσ θεοὺς ἐξ ἀνθρώπων γενόμενον δίκαιον ὅσιον καλοῦμεν* ["We call one among men who is just with respect to the gods, *ὅσιον*"].

ὅτι μόνος ὅσιος present the alone holiness of God simply as the ground because of which every one must fear him, and the name of God be praised by every one, the fundamental reference to the succeeding words is not so readily afforded. The interposition of the first clause ὅτι μόν. ὅσ. modifies in a certain degree the inner connection, in the sense that the words ὅτι πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, κ.τ.λ., which express the sum of the O. T. prophecies concerning the conversion of the Gentiles — and that, too, in its universality, so that the question is not that in fact only a certain number of the heathen are converted — give the foundation for the thought of the question, τίς οὐ μὴ φοβ., κ.τ.λ.: "Thee, who art the King of the nations, every one must and certainly shall fear, for all the nations shall adore Thee as their King." — ὅτι τὰ δικαιώματά σου ἐφανερώθησαν. For, from the works and judgments which the righteousness of God has executed, and in which he has been revealed as the βασιλεὺς τῶν ἐθνῶν, the nations shall learn to know his adorable name.[1]

Vv. 5–8. After the introductory song καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα (ver. 5),[2] the seven angels which hold the seven plagues come out of the heavenly temple, and receive seven vials full of the wrath of God. — ὁ ναὸς τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ μαρτυρίου ἐν τ. οὐρ. Cf. xi. 19. It is not the holy of holies[3] that is designated by the entire expression, but the proper temple[4] in heaven, which is more accurately described by the addition of the gen. τῆς σκ. τ. μαρτ.,[5] as the ναός belonging to the tabernacle of the testimony, i.e., including it,[6] — not as existing in the σκην. τ. μαρτ.[7] — The heavenly δόξα of the seven angels is to be seen from their adornment; one attribute, the golden girdle, they have in common even with the Lord himself.[8] The first expression ἐνδεδ. λίθον καθαρὸν λαμπρόν, in which, considering the manuscript authority for it, the λίθον can scarcely be a clerical error,[9] is by no means to be so explained as to refer to Christ himself, the corner-stone[10] or the "various adornments of virtues,"[11] as the clothing of the angel: if, however, only a comparison with Ezek. xxviii. 13 (πᾶν λίθον χρῆστον ἐνδέδεσαι) give an explanation that is at all events satisfactory, a plural, nevertheless, would possibly be expected, as πᾶν λιθ. stands in Ezekiel. The idea must, then, be that each angel wears a garment set with a pure, brilliant gem. The later expositors all follow the reading λίνον, according to which the angels appear in sacerdotal garments.[12] Hengstenb. compares this with xix. 8, where, however, the expression λίνον does not occur. Ew. ii. refers properly to the fact that the καθαρόν does not appear to require the idea of a garment. But the weight of the witnesses who advocate the reading which is more difficult, and yet not to be derived from Ezekiel,[13] is too great. ℵ also appears by its peculiarities to betray with what difficulty the attempt was made to explain away the difficult-to-be-understood λίθον.[14] — That one of the four beings (iv. 6) gives[15] to the angels the vials of wrath,

[1] Exod. ix. 16, xiv. 17 sq.; Ps. cxxvi. 2; Mic. vii. 16 sqq.
[2] See on ver. 1.
[3] Grot., etc.
[4] Cf. xi. 1.
[5] Cf., on this designation, Acts viii. 44; Exod. xxix. 10, 11, LXX.
[6] Ewald.
[7] De Wette.
[8] Cf. i. 13.
[9] Grot.
[10] 1 Pet. ii. 26.
[11] Andr., Beda.
[12] De Wette.
[13] Volkm.
[14] See Critical Notes.
[15] Cf. vi. 1, 3, 5, 7.

is significant, because it has to do with plagues which pertain to all earthly creatures whose representatives those beings are.[1] As in their song of praise in iv. 7, they looked towards the end, so also the end does not come without their participation.[2] — *τοῦ ζῶντος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.* The making eternity conspicuous has the same relation as already in i. 8. — *καὶ ἐγεμίσθη, κ.τ.λ.*, ver. 8. The *smoke* with which the temple is filled,[3] is not the sign of the incomprehensibility of the Divine judgments,[4] nor directly of the wrath of God;[5] but, as the text itself explains, that the smoke is represented as proceeding from the glory and power of God (*ἐκ δ. τ. θ. καὶ ἐκ τ. δυν. αὐτ.*), as a sign of the majesty, actually present in the *ναός*, of God revealing himself immediately in his power. In the cloud of smoke there the כבוד יהוה[6] is enthroned, which now, as the addition *κ. ἐκ τ. δυνάμεως αὐτ.* especially emphasizes, will be manifested on the side of its omnipotence. The subject, it is true, refers to a revelation of judgment upon enemies, that is full of grace to believers; but the interpretation of the smoke fails to be in accordance with the text, if this be regarded as, on that account, either a sign of Divine wrath, or even of God's grace working for the good of the godly.[7] Beng. says, correctly, concerning the *καπν.*: "The covering of Divine Majesty."[8] — *καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐδύνατο εἰσελθεῖν, κ.τ.λ.* The description depends upon types like Exod. xl. 34; 1 Kings viii. 10 sq.[9] Incorrect are all the allegorical explanations which depend upon the presumption that the heavenly *ναός* represents the Church on earth.[10] Just as incorrect, and entirely remote, Grot.: "God was not willing to give any other oracles but these." Nothing whatever is said, also, to the purport that no one could go into the temple, in order by prayer to avert the threatening judgments.[11] The correct explanation is derived from the words *ἄχρι τελεσθ., κ.τ.λ.*, which, upon the foundation of the general idea of the inaccessibility of God as present in his personal *δόξα*,[12] suggests that not until satisfaction shall be rendered his holy wrath, by the full execution of all the plagues impending from God's justice, shall access to him be possible. Until then, the immediate presence of his glory and power (ver. 8*a*) must consume all creatures.[13]

[1] Hengstenb. But cf. also Riehm, l. c., p. 24.

[2] Cf. also xix. 4.

[3] Cf. Isa. vi. 4.

[4] C. a Lap., etc.

[5] Andr., Grot., Heinr., Hengstenb., Ebrard.

[6] Exod. xl. 34. LXX.: *δόξα κυρίου.*

[7] Züllig, Hengstenb.

[8] Cf. also De Wette.

[9] De Wette, Hengstenb.

[10] Beda: "No one can be incorporated among the members of the Church unless one who listening learns the mysteries of faith from preachers." Coccejus: "Papal human ordinances hinder the faith of the most." Vitr.: "In the time of the plagues . . . there shall be such a demonstration of the glorious and gracious presence of God in the Church, as can be compared with the symbolical demonstration of the Divine presence in the tabernacle under the old covenant."

[11] Ewald, Stern.

[12] Cf. Exod. xix. 21; Isa. vi. 5.

[13] Cf. Hengstenb.; likewise also Züllig, De Wette.

Notes by the American Editor.

LXXVIII. Ver. 3. τὴν ᾠδὴν Μωυσέως, κ.τ.λ.

So Alford: "It betokens the unity of the O. and N. T. Churches. Their songs of triumph have become ours; the song of Moses is the song of the Lamb. In this great victory all the triumphs of God's people are included, and find their fulfilment." Gebhardt (p. 255): "That is, Christians above, after they have overcome all the temptations of antichrist, look upon the holy and righteous judgments of God, or his works and ways with the world, as once Israel looked upon the plagues of Egypt and the Red Sea, — indeed, in these visions, the Egyptian plagues frequently furnish the type, — they sing the song of the deliverance of their persons, the song of salvation, as the children of Israel once sung it (Exod. xv.), in its Christian fulfilment. Christian salvation is essentially that of the O. T., the completion once prepared, but now begun." J. Gerhard (*L. T.*, xviii. 17): "Because the Church triumphant consists of saints of the O. and the N. T.; and just as the Israelites, after their deliverance from Pharaonic bondage, praised God in the song of Moses (Exod. xv.), so the blessed, after their deliverance from the tyranny of persecutors, and all the adversities of this life, praise God in the song of the Lamb, or Christ."

CHAPTER XVI.

Ver. 1. *ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ.* Although omitted, possibly because of its seeming contradiction to xv. 8, in many documents and editions (even by Tisch. 1854 and IX.), it is guaranteed by A, C, ℵ, al., and is entirely suitable. — Ver. 2. Instead of *ἐπὶ τ. γ.* (Elz., Beng.), read *εἰς τ. γ.* in accordance with A, B, C (Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]; cf., already, Griesb.). But, according to the same witnesses and ℵ, read *ἐπὶ τ. ανθρ.* (Beng., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]), instead of *εἰς τ. ἀ.* (Elz.). — Ver. 3. *ψυχὴ ζωῆς ἀπέθ., τὰ ἐν τ. θαλ.* So also A, C, Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]. The rec. *ψυχ. ζῶσα ἀπέθ. ἐν τ. θαλ.* (ℵ: *ἐπὶ τ. θ.*) makes the text easier. — Ver. 5. *ὁσιος.* So A, B, C, Lach., Tisch. The rec. has interpolated *καὶ ὁ.* ℵ has the art. without the *καὶ* (Tisch. IX.). — Ver. 7. The interpretation *ἄλλον ἐκ* before *τοῦ θυσιαστ.* (Elz.) is rejected already by Beng., Griesb., in accordance with decisive testimonies. — Ver. 14. The *ἃ* before *ἐκπορεύεται* (Elz., Tisch.) is satisfactorily maintained by A, B. Lach. has deleted it upon the authority of the Vulg. ℵ$_1$ has the inf. indorsed by Ew. ii.; it is corrected: *ἐκπορεύεται*, without *ἃ*. — Ver. 17. The *ἀπὸ* before *τοῦ ναοῦ* (B, Elz., Tisch.) is to be preferred to the *ἐκ* (A, Beng., Lach., Tisch. IX. [W. and H.]), because the latter appears to be written in order to mark the *ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ* in distinction from the *ἀπὸ τοῦ θρόνου.* ℵ has only *ἐκ τ. ναοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ.* — Ver. 18. *ἄνθρωπος ἐγένετο.* So A, 38, Lach., Tisch. Elz. (Beng., Griesb. [W. and H.]), with B, verss., interpret: *οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἐγένοντο.*

At the command of a voice sounding forth from the heavenly temple, the seven angels pour forth their vials upon the earth; yet the plagues caused thereby not only work no repentance in the inhabitants of the earth worshipping the beast, but have rather the effect of leading them to the open blasphemy of God who has sent these plagues.[1] The more certainly, therefore, must these hardened men incur the now immediately impending final judgment, to which ver. 15 also expressly alludes.

All seven vials are poured forth successively, without interruption; for such does not occur either at vv. 5–7, or at ver. 7. This, as well as the circumstance also that the number seven of the vials appears to be resolved neither into three and four, as the epistles,[2] nor into four and three, as the seals and trumpets,[3] nor even into five and two,[4] — for the separation so prominent in the former series of visions, which could be found here with equal right in ver. 5 sqq., vv., 9, 11, 15, nevertheless dare be exclusively sought in none of these passages, — corresponds to the haste with which now the end itself, before which these last plagues (xv. 1) still lie, draws on.

[1] Vv. 9, 11, 21.
[2] Cf. p. 145.
[3] Cf. pp. 256, 315 sq. So in this passage, Beng., Eichh., Ewald, Züllig.
[4] Cf. De Wette.

That the vials have their place so directly before the actual end, is expressed also by the fact that the plagues proceeding therefrom are limited no longer to the third of the earth and its inhabitants, — as was the case in the trumpet-plagues, which, however, were already still more violent than the seal-plagues pertaining only to a fourth, — but they are inflicted upon the entire number of the inhabitants of the earth worshipping the beast (vv. 2, 8 sqq.), and all the sea, together with all that lives therein. The special parallelizing of the vials with the trumpets, which occurs in the sense of the recapitulation theory,[1] divides the progress, so clearly occurring and always accelerated, of the development which presses with great intensity to the catastrophe. Already the first vial has in its effect no analogy whatever with the first trumpet, so that the text of itself presents an obstacle to arbitrary parallelizing. The analogies which occur between vials 2, 3, and trumpets 2, 3, vial 6 and trumpet 6, vial 7 and seal 6, give no basis whatever for the recapitulation-parallelism, partly because the other numbers of the vials, trumpets (and seals) do not agree, partly because the seeming parallels are essentially distinguished from one another also in individual points;[2] partly. also, because a certain repetition of particular means of plague, which, however, forms also a gradation of the same, was indeed unavoidable, since, for a thrice-repeated sevenfold series of visions, the sphere whence the prophetic contemplation of the plagues must be developed could not always offer new forms, — and such plagues particularly must appear to be repeated, as presented themselves after the type of the Egyptian plagues to the contemplating mind of John.

Ver. 1. *μεγάλης φωνῆς ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ.* According to xv. 8, the voice sounding from the heavenly temple can belong only to God himself.[3] This is not expressed, because John with all fidelity limits himself to that which he recognized, and *as* he actually recognizes it. — *Ὑπάγετε.* Cf. the *ἀπῆλθεν*, ver. 2, which is understood of itself in ver. 3, etc. The angels have possibly held themselves in readiness, standing at the gate of the temple (xv. 5 sqq.); now they come to a place in heaven, whence they can pour forth the destructive contents of their vials. — *τ. ἑπτὰ φιάλας τοῦ θυμοῦ τ. θ.* Cf. xv. 7. Targum, Isa. lxi. 22: "The vials of the cup of my wrath."[4] — *εἰς τὴν γῆν.* As viii. 5.

Ver. 2. The *first* vial poured forth upon the earth (*εἰς τὴν γῆν*, in relation to ver. 1, as viii. 7 to viii. 5) produces a severe ulcer. — *ἕλκος κακὸν καὶ πονηρόν.* Cf. Exod. ix. 10 sqq.; Deut. xxviii. 35.[5] The *πονηρόν*[6] designates, besides the *κακον*, which expresses only the evil nature, the virulence, malignity, and affliction of the ulcer.[7] — *ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀνθρ., κ.τ.λ.* The accus. after *ἐπί* results[8] from the idea that the plague extends to the men.[9] — *τ. ἔχ. τὸ χάραγμα, κ.τ.λ.* Cf. xiii. 15 sqq., xiv. 9 sqq. Of such a pestilence as there was at Rome[10] in Nero's time, nothing is said.

[1] Cf. Introduction, p. 13 sq.
[2] Cf., e.g., vial 6 with trumpet 6.
[3] Beng., Züll., Hengstenb.
[4] In Wetst.
[5] LXX.: *ἕλκος πονηρόν.* So also Job ii. 7.
[6] Suidas: *ἐπιπονον.*
[7] Cf. my commentary on 1 John iii. 12.
[8] Cf. Luke i. 65, iii. 2. De Wette.
[9] Cf. Winer, p. 380.
[10] Volkm.

Ver. 3. The *second* vial changes the great sea into blood, as that of a dead man, so that every thing living therein dies. — *καὶ ἐγένετο αἷμα ὡς νεκροῦ.* According to the analogy of viii. 8, 11, *ἡ θάλασσα* is to be regarded as the subject to *ἐγένετο.*[1] The advance of the present plague, in comparison with viii. 8, lies not only in that now the *entire* sea is changed into blood, and that every thing living therein dies, but also in that the sea becomes "as the blood of a dead man," i.e., not a great pool of blood, as of many slain,[2] but the horribleness of the fact is augmented in that the sea seems like the clotted and already putrefying blood of a dead man.[3] — *ψυχὴ ζωῆς.* The var. correctly give the meaning: *ψ. ζῶσα.*[4] The expression originates from Gen. i. 30: *ὃ ἔχει ἐν. ἑαυτῷ ψυχὴν ζωῆς.* Cf. on the gen. limitation *ζωῆς,* Winer, p. 177 sq. — The *τὰ* before *ἐν τ. θαλ.*[5] refers, as to meaning, to the individual *κτίσματα* comprised in the collective *πᾶσα ψυχ.*[6]

Vv. 4-7. The *third* vial changes all other streams into blood. The angel of the waters and the heavenly altar praises the righteousness of God's judgments. — *καὶ ἐγένετο αἷμα.* "And it became blood," i.e., blood came forth. It is true, indeed, that, as to the form of the expression, it is not said that the streams became blood; the reading is not *ἐγένοντο.* But the analogy with viii. 11[7] suggests that the blood entered into the streams into which the vials were poured.[8] — Since the streams are thus affected by the plague, the angel who presides over the waters is the first to recognize adoringly the righteousness of this Divine manifestation of wrath. — *τοῦ ἀγγέλου τῶν ὑδάτων.* Incorrectly, Grotius: "Because he emptied the vial into the waters." A definite angel is meant, who is placed over the streams as a special sphere.[9] There is an analogy not so much in what is presented in vii. 1 and xiv. 18, — for what is said there of the angels of wind and fire[10] is not meant in the same sense, — as rather in the idea of the four beings who appear in iv. 6 sqq. as representatives of earthly creatures.[11] Precisely similar[12] is Daniel's representation of angelic princes who belong to particular nations.[13] Cf. also Schöttgen, *Hor. Hebr.*, on this passage; and Eisenmenger, *Entd. Judenth.*, ii. 377 sq., where a large number of rabbinical expressions concerning earth-, sea-, fire-, and other angels, and their special names, are collected. In *Bava Bathra*, p. 72, 2,[14] the prince of the sea is called רחב, after Job xxvi. 12; in another book,[15] he is called Michael, and seven less important angels stand beneath him. — *ὅσιος.* Cf. xv. 4. As the solemn formula *ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν*[16] does

[1] Beng., etc. Against De Wette: *es estand Blut.*

[2] *νεκροῦ = νεκρῶν.* C. a Lap., Eichh., De Wette, Hengstenb., etc.

[3] Beng., Züll., etc.

[4] Cf. viii. 9: *κτίσματα τὰ ἔχοντα ψυχάς.*

[5] See Critical Notes.

[6] Cf. v. 13.

[7] Cf. also ver. 3.

[8] Against De Wette.

[9] Andr., C. a Lap., Ewald, Züll., De Wette, Hengstenb.

[10] De Wette.

[11] Cf. also viii. 2, where seven angels of special rank are mentioned.

[12] Hengstenb. compares John v. 4. Although he considers the water in this passage, as also viii. 10, as an allegorical designation of prosperity; although, further, the passage John v. 4 is spurious, and nothing whatever is said of an angel placed over the water in general, but only of one sent for a particular service to a single pool, — yet he would have us find here "a delicate and inner bond" between the Apoc. and the Gospel.

[13] Dan. x. 13, 21, xii. 1.

[14] Schöttg.

[15] Eisenmenger, p. 379.

[16] The *καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος* is absent here, as in xi. 17, because the coming to judgment is already in process of execution.

not allow an immediate combination with ὅσιος,[1] and as before ὅσιος, neither ὁ, nor καὶ, nor καὶ ὁ, dare be read,[2] and consequently the translation of Hengstenb. ("the godly") is false, we can only, in the sense adopted by Luther, who, however, interpolates an "*and*," regard the ὅσιος as placed with δίκαιος by asyndeton, as a predicate belonging to εἶ: "Righteous art thou, which art, and which wast, holy" [art thou], "because thou hast ordained such judgments:" ὅτι ταῦτα ἔκρ. The ταῦτα refers to ver. 4, not to ver. 3; for that which is the subject of treatment (ver. 6) is drinking-water that is changed into blood, so that the inhabitants of the earth who have shed the blood of saints and prophets[3] must drink blood.[4] The closing words of the angelic discourse, ἄξιοί εἰσιν, whose force is not destroyed by the absence of a connective, expressly designate that the enemies have merited this judgment. — Upon the angel's ascription of praise, there follows yet, in ver. 7, another from the side of the altar, which, responding to the former and confirming it (Ναί, κ.τ.λ.), makes a further reference in general to the judgments of God, and thus brings the entire ascription of praise from ver. 5 to a conclusion.[5] — τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου λέγοντος. An attempt has been made to evade the idea of the text that the words of praise proceed from the altar itself, by the interpolation of ἄλλου (sc. ἀγγέλου), ἐκ before θυσ.,[6] or by allegorizing,[7] or by the supply of a personality.[8] But De Wette correctly acknowledges[9] the significant personification of the altar itself. This is in some measure prepared for already by ix. 13; but the idea embodied therein is to be recognized from vi. 10 sqq., viii. 3, ix. 13, xiv. 18. From the same place whence the prayers for vengeance had arisen, and already special manifestations of God's wrath had proceeded, the righteousness of all the judgments of God, whereby the longing of the saints is fully satisfied, is proclaimed.

Vv. 8, 9. The *fourth* vial, poured out upon the sun, produces[10] terrific heat. Men, however, are not brought by all these plagues to repentance, but only to blasphemy of God. — ἐδόθη αὐτῷ; viz., to the sun,[11] not to the angel;[12] the meaning is that by the pouring-forth of the vials upon the sun, this is in like manner made a means of plague, as in ver. 3 the sea, and in ver. 4 other streams. The sun receives ἐξουσία adapted to its nature for these special plagues.[13] It concurs with the false reference of the ἐδ. αυτῷ, that — Hengstenb. excepted, who wants to understand the sun, as well as also the fire, allegorically — Bengel refers the ἐν πυρί to still another fire than that proceeding from the glowing sun. — καῦμα μέγα. On the accus. with ἐκαυματίσθησαν, cf. Winer, p. 214. — καὶ ἐβλασφήμησαν, κ.τ.λ.

[1] Against De Wette: "Thou who art and wast holy."

[2] See Critical Notes, p. 414.

[3] Cf. xiii. 7, 10, vi. 10, xi. 7, xvii. 6, xix. 2.

[4] πεῖν. On this form, see Winer, p. 84.

[5] Cf. v. 8, 11, 13, 14.

[6] Luther, Züll., etc.

[7] Beda: "The inner affection of saints, angels, or men, who by teaching rule the people." Andr.: "The angelic powers as bearers of our prayers."

[8] Grot.: "viz., the angel who guards the spirits of the martyrs." Cf. vi. 10. Ewald: "A voice proceeding from an inhabitant of heaven standing by the divine altar." Cf. also Züll., Ebrard, etc.

[9] Cf. also Beng. and Hengstenb., who nevertheless speak indefinitely of an angel of the altar.

[10] Cf., on the other hand, viii. 12.

[11] De Wette, Bleek.

[12] Beng., Hengstenb., Ew. ii.

[13] Cf. the ἐδόθη, vi. 4, 8, vii. 2, ix. 3, 5.

Just because men perceive that the plagues come from God, before whom they, nevertheless, will not bow,[1] they become the more hardened.

Vv. 10, 11. The *fifth* vial, poured upon the throne of the beast, brings an eclipse over his entire realm. This increase of sorrows also works upon the impenitent inhabitants of the earth in such a way that they blaspheme God. — *ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον τοῦ θηρίου.* The throne of the beast beheld in definite reality (xiii. 2), the actual centre of his entire kingdom, is here meant; incorrect are all interpretations [2] which explain away the concrete clearness of the presentation.[3] — *καὶ ἐγένετο ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ ἐσκοτωμένη*, cf. Exod. x. 21 sqq.; Ps. cv. 28. Even in this special circumstance is the plague like the Egyptian, in that this darkness is produced not by an injury to the sun,[4] but by an immediate miraculous act.[5] By the expression *ἐσκοτωμ.* an external eclipse must be considered, so that the plague is homogeneous with those of the preceding vials. The false interpretation of the *ἐσκοτωμ.* in Grot.,[6] Calov., Vitr., Hengstenb., etc., coincides with the allegorical view of the whole.[7] For the correct understanding of the *ἐσκοτωμ.*, it follows of itself that *ἡ βασιλεία αὐτ.* can designate not the rulership,[8] but only the kingdom of the beast considered according to its geographical extent. — *καὶ ἐμασῶντο τὰς γλώσσας, κ.τ.λ.* "And they gnawed their tongues." Andr., very properly: "The gnawing of the tongues shows the excess of the pain." The text itself gives the explanation: *ἐκ τοῦ πονύ.*[9] The darkness causes a peculiar pain, because of its character as a plague. This particular *πόνος*, however, is, according to ver. 11, to be thought of in connection with the plagues produced by the preceding vials (*τῶν πόνων αὐτ.*), among which the first is still expressly emphasized: *καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἑλκῶν αὐτ.* The horrible darkness makes the other sufferings — identified by Hengstenb. with the darkness which he understands figuratively — still more oppressive and comfortless; for the last plagues also [10] are, in comparison with the seal- and trumpet-plagues, so dreadfully increased, because, while the former plagues came successively, these vial-plagues occur in such a way that the one is combined with the other. During the fifth vial-plague, at all events the first, and without doubt the second and third, are still continuing. The fourth (ver. 8) is naturally not to be regarded in connection with the fifth; but under the fourth, we are expressly referred to all the preceding plagues (ver. 9: *τὰς πληγ. ταύτ.*). — *τὸν θεὸν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.* Cf. xi. 13. The designation has here a reference as in ver. 9 the *τοῦ ἔχ. ἐξουσ., κ.τ.λ.* — *μετεν. ἐκ τ. ἔργ. αὐτ.* Cf. ix. 20 sq.

Vv. 12–16. The *sixth* vial is poured upon the Euphrates, and causes it to dry up, in order that the kings of the East might pass through. Three unclean spirits, which in the form of frogs issue from the mouths of the dragon, and the two beasts serving the dragon, gather the inhabitants of

[1] ix. 20; cf. xi. 13.

[2] In violation also of the analogy of vv. 2, 3, 4, 8.

[3] Against C. a Lap.: "Upon the kingdom and subjects of antichrist," etc.

[4] Cf. ver. 8 sqq.

[5] De Wette.

[6] The Roman dominion lost much of its pristine splendor.

[7] Cf. on ver. 21.

[8] Hengstenb. Cf. Grot.

[9] Cf., on the *ἐκ*, vv. 11, 21. Winer, p. 347.

[10] xv. 1.

the earth at Armagedon. — *τὸν ποταμὸν τὸν μέγαν τὸν Εὐφράτην.* In the sense of ix. 14 the starting-point is indicated, in a schematic way, for the kings coming from the East, for whom God himself makes the way by drying up the Euphrates. The correct estimate of this point is gained only by considering it in connection with the correct conception of "the kings" coming from "the East." The problem in general is so to understand all the particular features of the representation (vv. 12–16), especially also the significant local designation (ver. 16), that this vial-vision correspond with the essential meaning of the other vials. Accordingly, as a whole, nothing else can be represented than a revelation of judgment pertaining to the inhabitants of the earth, according to the analogy of the plagues proceeding from the other vials. By a comparison with ix. 14 sqq., the suggestion is readily made, that the Eastern kings themselves may be regarded the executors of the plagues. So Ewald, who refers to the Parthian allies with whom the returning Nero[1] would go up against Rome.[2] But the kings of the East belong rather to the *βασιλεῖς τῆς οἰκουμένης ὅλης* (ver. 14), and appear as leaders of the inhabitants of the whole earth, and, accordingly, as instruments of the dragon and the beast (cf. ver. 13), who go up to war, not against Babylon, but rather against believers.[3] The kings of the East are identical with the ten kings (xvii. 12 sqq.) who give their power to the beast.[4] Just as in xi. 7 the beast from the abyss was mentioned proleptically, which nevertheless does not enter definitely into the development before ch. xiii., so here a statement is made concerning definite kings (*τῶν βασ. τῶν ἀπὸ ἀν., κ.τ.λ.*), whose more specific relation to the beast[5] does not become clear until from xvii. 12 sqq., but whose fate is indicated first only in this passage (ver. 16), yet is not expressly stated until the actual end.[6] For the plague of the sixth vial does not lie in the fact that those kings come, — this is rather a proof of the apparently victorious defiance of the secular power, — but that they assemble at Armagedon; i.e., a place where they shall be brought to naught with their insolent power.[7] Bengel[8] has already correctly acknowledged this by saying very appropriately, even though he very preposterously thinks of the inroads of the Turks: "It is these very kings who blindly incur the plagues." While in ver. 12 the coming of the kings was so stated, that thereby the purpose of God leading those enemies to destructive judgment might be marked;[9] on the other hand, in ver. 13 sq., it is emphasized as to how these Eastern and all kings of the earth in general are gathered together by the dragon to the conflict against believers. [See Note LXXIX., p. 425.] Immediately from the mouth of the dragon himself (*ἐκ τ. στομ.*),[10] and mediately from the dragon, from the mouths of the two beasts equipped by the same

[1] Cf. xiii. 3.

[2] "In order to sustain Nero, attending antichrist, they come to destroy the city." Cf. also Eichh., Heinr., Volkm., Hilgenf.; Ebrard also belongs here, in so far as he identifies the kings of the East with the four angels (ix. 15), and regards their expedition directed first, at least, against Babylon, and then, of course, also against believers.

[3] Cf. xii. 17, xiii. 7, xvii. 12 sqq., xix. 19.

[4] De Wette.

[5] Cf. ver. 13.

[6] Cf. xix. 19.

[7] See on ver. 16.

[8] Cf. De Wette, Hengstenb.

[9] Cf. Mic. iv. 12 sq.

[10] Cf. ix. 17, xi. 5. Incorrectly, C. a Lap., etc.: "At the command."

for the conflict against believers,[1] three unclean spirits are sent forth, of those which serve the dragon, in order to bring together the kings of the earth. — *ἀκάθαρτα.* This formal attribute also[2] designates the demoniacal nature of these spirits.[3] — *ὡς βάτραχοι.* This addition is not to be referred to the mere *ἀκάθαρτα*, but designates, in the sense of the var. *ὅμοια βατράχοις*, the form in which those spirits appear. It is possible that this form of illustration depends upon an allusion to Exod. viii. 1 sqq.,[4] although the batrachian form of the spirits bears no reference whatever to any peculiar pestilential nature of frogs, as the spirits are to be regarded only as such as, according to the wish of the dragon and of the two beasts, by their deceptive persuasion, move the kings to the expedition against Babylon. But what or who be meant by these three spirits, is a question originating from the same misunderstanding as that which, e.g., attempts in ix. 14 sqq. to find a supposed fulfilment of prophecy within the sphere of ecclesiastical or secular-historical facts. To the false question, necessarily, the most arbitrary answers are given. The three spirits are, according to Grot.: "Divination by inspection of entrails, by the flight of birds, and the sibylline books, in which Maxentius trusted" (for vv. 12–16 refer, according to Grot., Hammond, etc., to the rout of Maxentius by Constantine); according to Vitr., who explains the drying-up of the Euphrates by the circumstance that the kingdom of France, drained by its kings, could send no more money to the Pope, the spirits are to be understood as referring to the Jesuits; according to Calov.: "The Jesuits, Capuchins, and Calvinists;" according to others,[5] "The Jesuits, Macchiavellians, and Spinozists." Even Luther explains: "The frogs are the sophists, like Faber, Eck, Emser, etc., who banter much against the gospel, and yet effect nothing, and remain frogs." But to the contemplation of the seer, the three spirits have the same reality as the dragon and his two beasts, from whose mouths the spirits actually proceeded.[6] — *εἰσὶ γὰρ πνεύματα δαιμονίων ποιοῦντα σημεῖα.* The parenthesis which designates the unclean spirits expressly as spirits of demons explains their efficacy by the remembrance that they are spirits of demons which could perform miraculous signs. Just as the dwellers upon the earth are brought by the false prophet to the adoration of the beast,[7] not without the working of miracles, so these three spirits also use their miraculous signs as a means whereby they attempt to bring together the kings of the earth. — *ἃ ἐκπορεύεται ἐπὶ τ. βασιλ. τῆς οἰκουμ. ὅλης, συναγαγεῖν αὐτοὺς, κ.τ.λ.* As the words *ἃ ἐκπορ.* referring back to what precedes the parenthesis, relatively carry still further the clause *κ. εἶδον ἐκ τ. στομ., κ.τ.λ.*, they supply in this way the partic. *ἐκπορευόμενα* not written in ver. 13. — *ἐπὶ τοὺς βασιλ.* Cf. xiv. 6; Matt. iii. 7.[8] The kings of the whole earth, the rulers of all the inhabitants of the earth worshipping the beast,[9] are those to whom the spirits here take their course. They betake themselves to the kings, "to gather them together" (*συναγαγεῖν*, inf., as xii. 17) "to the battle of that great day of God Almighty." That this day

[1] xiii. 1, 11.
[2] Matt. x. 1; Mark i. 26.
[3] Ver. 14: *πνεύμ. δαιμονίων.* Cf. xviii. 2.
[4] Ew. ii.
[5] Cf. Wolf.
[6] Cf., besides, ix. 17 sq., also ix. 1–11.
[7] xiii. 12 sqq.
[8] Winer, p. 380.
[9] xiv. 6, 11, xiii. 3 sq., 12.

is often not understood[1] in its eschatological definitiveness, i.e.,[2] as the future day of final judgment,[3] is owing to the fact that the relation of the sixth (and seventh) vial to the actual end[4] is not properly appreciated. As by the mention of definite kings, ver. 12 was comprehended already in the development of the proper final catastrophe, so ver. 14 also, by the reference to the conflict against the saints to be undertaken by all the kings of the world combined on the day of final judgment, alludes to a point which does not actually occur until in the last time of xix. 19.[5] But it is just this which corresponds with the character of the penultimate plagues among those that are "last,"[6] that here the demoniacal spirits come forth, who unite those kings together with their hosts of people in an attack to be completed at the actual end, which will then result, on that great day, by the judgment of Almighty God (*τ. θεοῦ τ. παντ.*),[7] in the complete ruin of the enemies.[8] But as thus reference is made from the sphere of the vials to the actual end, the artistic plan of the Apoc. again stands forth, involving with it that the nearer the proper final judgment with its distinct acts occurs, the more definitely appears the connection between it and its various forms of preparations, which have come into view in series of visions that, although they are distinct, yet interpenetrate one another. — In this also the feeling is expressed, that the day of judgment is impending so closely, that the comfort which is introduced with such emphasis in ver. 15 is occasioned by the definite allusion to the same in ver. 14.[9] — *Ἰδοὺ ἔρχομαι, κ.τ.λ.* The prophet speaks immediately as in the name of the Lord himself.[10] With formal incorrectness, Hengstenberg says that Christ himself actually speaks. — *ὡς κλέπτης*, cf. iii. 3. On any day, at any hour, therefore, the Lord may come, and thus that great day of the Lord open. Upon this is based the admonition succeeding without express connection, which, first of all by proffering the blessed reward,[11] encourages to watchfulness,[12] and to the faithful keeping, by believers, of their garments,[13] but then, also, on the other hand, does not refrain from threatening disgrace and punishment against the faithless.[14] After the parenetic interlude, there follows in ver. 16 the conclusion belonging to ver. 14: *καὶ συνήγαγεν αὐτούς*. As the subject we can regard neither the sixth-vial angel,[15] nor God,[16] nor the dragon,[17] but only the *πνεύματα τρία ἀκαθ.* (ver. 13),[18] since the *συνήγαγεν*, with the corresponding expression, designates that which was named in ver. 14, as the purpose of those spirits.[19]

[1] So Beng., De Wette; cf. also Ew.1., who, however, like Elchh., refers only to the devastation of Rome.

[2] Cf. ver. 15.

[3] Matt. vii. 22; Luke xvii. 24, 31; Heb. x. 25; Jude, 6. Cf. 1 Thess. v. 21.

[4] Cf. Beda: "The *ἡμερα* is the entire time from the Lord's passion." Hengstenb.: "The day of God has a comprehensive character, which unites into one picture all the phases in it of the judgment of God against ungodly wickedness."

[5] Cf. also Ew. ii. and Volkm.

[6] xv. 1.

[7] Cf. i. 8, xi. 17, xvi. 7.

[8] Cf. ver. 16.

[9] Cf. xiii. 9 sqq., xiv. 12 sqq.

[10] Cf. xxii. 7, 12, 20; De Wette.

[11] Cf. xiv. 3, xix. 9, xxii. 7, 14.

[12] iii. 2 sq.

[13] Cf. iii. 18, vii. 14.

[14] Cf. iii. 18, also vii. 9, 14.

[15] Beng.

[16] Hengstenb., Ebrard.

[17] Ver. 13; Ew. ii.; Volkm.: "The beast."

[18] Ewald, Bleek, De Wette.

[19] *ἃ ἐκπορ. συναγαγεῖν*. Observe here also the sing. with the *ἃ*.

The peculiar point of the entire section (vv. 12–16) lies in the significant naming of the place of assembling of the antichristian kings of the world: In Hebrew the place is called Ἁρμαγεδών. The name is to be explained either etymologically, i.e., from the meaning of the Hebrew words contained therein, or historically, i.e., so that the Hebrew proper name, by its reference to some fact of the O. T. history, appears characteristically for the present case, which is accordingly transferred to that Armagedon. The etymological explanation is attempted by many of the older writers without a proper foundation in a linguistic respect.[1] The most admissible is the interpretation of Drusius, who understands the words חרכה "destruction," and גדהון "army," so that the entire name means "the slaughter of their army." This is more correct in a linguistic respect, and as a matter of fact, than when Rinck makes of it a compound of אַרמוֹן (which he regards as meaning "castle") and נָבַר "fortress," and thus finds the capital designated; just as Grot., who in other respects follows, in etymological explanation, the footsteps of Drusius, solves it as "Mons Janiculus." But if John had had in mind the obscure verbal interpretation of the name Arm., he would scarcely have refrained from giving the Greek explanation to his readers in Asia Minor;[2] on which account we are the rather directed to the historical interpretation by a significant prototype. This has been attempted in various ways by Tichon., Ribera, Coccejus, Vitr., Bengel, Eichhorn, Ewald, Züllig, Hofm., Hengstenb., Ebrard, Bleek, Volkm.,[3] in combination with the etymological interpretation.[4] The place at which, in the times of the judges, the Canaanite kings were slaughtered by the Israelites,[5] and where King Josiah was defeated by the Egyptians,[6] the LXX. call Μαγεδώ (Μαγεδδώ). The allusion to one of the two events would be liable to no doubt whatever, if John had not named the locality meant by him as Ἁρμαγεδών (חַר מְגִדּוֹ), i.e., Mount Megiddo, while the more express determinations in the O. T. read either ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ Μαγ.[7] or ἐπὶ ὕδατι Μαγ.[8] But this additional circumstance, which also admits at least of a probable explanation,[9] can in no way lead us astray as to the chief reference of the name Megiddo in the O. T. Yet the defeat of the people of God, and of his King Josiah, cannot be the prototype for this passage,[10] as the subject here has respect to a defeat of antichristian

[1] According to Beda, Ἁρμαγ. is meant to be "a holy city, i.e., the Church." He compares then xx. 9. Yet he regards also possible: "insurrection against what precedes," "a spherical mountain," so as to designate "a place of the godless." Andr. interprets, διακοπή. It indicates the extermination (ἐκκόπτεσθαι) of enemies. C. a Lap. explains: "The artifice of the congregation, because God, as it were, by an artifice will unite those kings with antichrist, so as to destroy all in one day." More to the same effect in the *Crit. Sacr.* Luther has the gloss: "In German, doomed warriors, accursed equipment, or unsuccessful warriors, from Herem and Gad."

[2] Cf. ix. 11; Beng., Hengstenb.

[3] Cf. also De Wette, who, however, vacillates.

[4] Vitr., Eichh., Züllig.

[5] Judg. v. 19.

[6] 2 Kings xxiii. 29 sqq.; 2 Chron. xxxv. 22. Cf. Zech. xii. 11.

[7] 2 Chron., l. c.

[8] Judg., l. c.

[9] See above.

[10] It is said incorrectly (Hengstenb., Hofm., etc.), that the reference to the defeat of Josiah is rendered the more probable by the example of Zech. xii. 11; for if on the one hand the contents of Zech. l. c. are completely distinct from those of this passage, it is also to be observed that the LXX., of whom John is by no means

enemies;[1] but only the victory of Israel,[2] as it is described in Judg. v. 19, won by God's miraculous aid over the βασιλεῖς Χαναάν at Megiddo. By designating the place, therefore, where the antichristian kings assemble for battle against Christ and his Church, by that name, it is indicated that the fate of the antichristian kings shall be the same as that of the Canaanites formerly at Megiddo. With this thought, the designation Mount Megiddo appears also to correspond. For as the subject has to do not with an actual, but only with an ideal, geographical specification, in the designation *Mount* Meg., there can lie an intimation of the immovableness and victory of the Church of God.[3] [See Note LXXX., p. 425.] This ideal character of the geographical designation prevents, however, the explanation that Armagedon is Rome,[4] or the mountains of Judah, where the enemies are to gather until they are annihilated in the Valley of Jehoshaphat.[5] Without any support whatever in the text is the view of Ew. ii., that since the numerical value of ארכגדון is the same as that of רוכה חגדולח (viz., 304), by hieroglyphic art "Rome the great" is expressly designated. Concerning the *number* of a name,[6] nothing whatever is said in this passage.[7]

Vv. 17–21. The *seventh* vial poured into the air brings — after a voice proceeding from the throne of God has proclaimed the end — unprecedented plagues upon the chief city of the beast and the entire empire. Yet men continue their blasphemy of God. — ἐπὶ τὸν ἀέρα. Cf. ver. 8. — φωνὴ μεγ. ἀπὸ τοῦ ναοῦ. According to this, the voice of God himself is to be understood just as in ver. 1; the further designation ἀπὸ τοῦ θρόνου shows this with still greater certainty. As the command to pour forth the vials was imparted by God himself, so there also comes forth from God's own mouth the final exclamation comprised in *one* word: Γέγονεν. This γέγονεν, "*factum est*,"[8] refers to ver. 1; now that is done which is there commanded.[9] Cf. xxi. 6, where, likewise, a definite determination of the subject results from the connection. Thus the explanation of Eichh., Ewald,[10] is far out of the way, while that of Grot.,[11] which recalls the Virgilian: *Fuimus Troes*, is inapposite. — καὶ ἐγένοντο ἀστραπαί, κ.τ.λ. The same signs, only extremely heightened, which also, xi. 19, signalize the immediately impending entrance of the actual end; yet the misunderstanding — as though in vv. 28–21 the end itself were described — is removed by the text itself, because it treats

independent, do not have there the name Μαγεδώ at all. They explain it as ἐν πεδίῳ ἐκκοπτομένου. With this the above-cited interpretation of Andreas is in remarkable agreement. — Possible, and of interesting facility, is the explanation of Hitzig (cf. Hilgenf., p. 440): Ἁρμαγ. = הר עֵר, i.e., the city M. Cf. also Kienlen. But it is not perceptible why John would not have abode by the mere name Μαγ., if he had not wished to give the idea of the mountain.

[1] Against Ewald, Hengstenb.; also against Hofm., *Schriftbew.*, II. 2, p. 639, who, however, makes the alteration, that in the beginning of the war the experience of the saints shall be that of the Israelites at Megiddo, but that finally the enemies shall be trodden down in the Valley of Jehoshaphat.

[2] Beng., Ebrard, Kliefoth.

[3] Cf. Ps. cxxi. 1, cxxv. 2.

[4] Ewald.

[5] Züllig.

[6] Cf. xiii. 18.

[7] Bleek already has declared against Ew.

[8] Vulg.

[9] Luke xiv. 22; Beng., De Wette, Hengstenb.

[10] *Actum est*, i.e., the end and sure destruction of Rome is at hand.

[11] *Fuit Roma*. Cf. also Vitr.

of a particular vial-plague, which, like the preceding, expressly makes known, also in ver. 21 (*κ. ἐβλασφ., κ.τ.λ.*), its only preparatory significance with respect to the actual final judgment. — *κ. ἐγέν. ἡ πόλις ἡ μεγάλη εἰς τρία μέρη, κ.τ.λ.* From the connection of ch. xiii., as well as from the context, ch. xvi., it undoubtedly follows that "the great city," which was rent into three parts, is identical with "great Babylon,"[1] i.e., the metropolis of the world, which appeared in ch. xiii. in the form of the beast from the sea.[2] In addition to the great city divided into three parts,[3] the other "cities of the nations" which fall down are also mentioned. The great city, or great Babylon, is, therefore, heathen Rome,[4] not Jerusalem.[5] The heathen metropolis is affected in the same way by the mighty earthquake which the last vial brings, — but in a heightened degree, — as in xi. 13, the city of Jerusalem is by the final visitation in the second woe. But there the last plague, which comes upon Jerusalem before the final judgment,[6] works repentance in the rest; while in the heathen metropolis, and in the entire realm of the beast, all the plagues, even those which are most dreadful, effect nothing but persevering blasphemy of God.[7] — *ἐμνήσθη ἐνώπιον τ. θ., κ.τ.λ.* On the expression, cf. Acts x. 31; on the thing designated, Ps. x. 13. — *τὸ ποτήριον τ. οἴν. τ. θυμοῦ τῆς ὀργῆς αὐτου.* The expression[8] is just as full as possible, because it is intended to state how the wrath (*ὀργή*) existing in God operates in its entire force. Vitr. explains *θυμὸς τῆς ὀργῆς* excellently by *excandescentia irae.*[9] [See Note LXXXI., p. 426.] On ver. 20, cf. vi. 14. — *ὡς ταλαντιαία.* The monstrous size of the hail, whereby the plague is rendered so dreadful.[10] Hailstones of the weight of a *mina* (*μνααῖ αι*), Diodor. Sicul., xix. 45, already calls incredibly great; but in this passage hailstones of the weight of a talent, which contains sixty minae, therefore, designates them as so heavy as though thrown, like sling-stones, from catapults.[11] — *κ. ἐβλασφήμησαν, κ.τ.λ.* It dare not be urged[12] that here also the impenitence is not expressly mentioned, and it is not here stated that this immediately fatal hail left no time for repentance, that the men thus struck by the same could, only when dying, still blaspheme;[13] for it is scarcely the meaning, that those individuals, who have been struck by the dreadful hail, utter their blasphemies in the very moment of death; but rather, while the hail falls, the *men* blaspheme, i.e., those not immediately struck by it, who, nevertheless, have before their eyes the plague threatening them every moment. Some fall, struck dead; others blaspheme.

The vial-visions have received an allegorical interpretation in the same way as the seal- and trumpet-visions. As an example the following may be

[1] Cf. xiv. 8.

[2] Cf also ch. xvii.

[3] The number *three* (cf. viii. 7, 8, 11, 18) has possibly a reference to the three chief enemies, ver. 13 (Ebrard).

[4] Alcas., Ewald, De Wette, Volkm., Bleek, Hengstenb.

[5] Andreas, C. a Lap., Beng., Züll., Stern., Ebrard, etc., who increase the confusion by explaining the great city, partly, like Ebrard, in the sense of xi. 8; and great Babylon, on the other hand, according to xiv. 8.

[6] Cf. xi. 15 sqq.

[7] Ver. 21. Cf. vv. 9, 11.

[8] Cf. xiv. 10.

[9] "Irascibility of anger."

[10] Ver. 21*b*.

[11] Cf. Joseph., *B. J.*, v. 6, 3: *ταλανταῖοι — οἱ βαλλόμενοι πέτροι.*

[12] Beng., Hengstenb.

[13] Hengstenb.

noticed:[1] Wetst., who in it all saw a representation of the Vitellian war, explained ver. 2 of diseases in the army of Vitellius, ver. 3 of the treachery of the fleet, ver. 19 the τρία μέρη (the three parties), as the Vitellian, the Flavian, and that of the Roman people. The last, Grot. refers to the fact that Totila had demolished the third of the walls of Rome. Nevertheless, the explanation of three classes of men has found most approval.[2] Vitr. interprets ver. 2 as referring to the exposure of the corruption of the Church by the Waldenses; ver. 3, to wars between the Popes and the Emperors (1056-1211); ver. 4, to the Church's thirst for blood, manifested in Castnitz; ver. 10 sq., to the obscuring of the Papacy by the Reformation.[3] Beng. and Hengstenb. repeat their explanations, known already from the former visions, that the earth, ver. 2, is Asia; the sea, ver. 3, is Europe;[4] that ver. 3 refers to the shedding of blood in war, and ver. 4 to the infringement of prosperity.[5] The islands and mountains, ver. 20, are, according to Andr., churches and church-teachers; according to Hengstenb., kingdoms.

Notes by the American Editor.

LXXIX. Ver. 12. τῶν βασιλέω τῶν ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς.

In entire harmony with Düsterdieck, Alford: "In order to understand what we here read, we must carefully bear in mind the whole context. From what follows under this same vial, we learn that the kings of the whole earth are about to be gathered to the great battle against God, in which he shall be victorious, and they shall utterly perish. The time is now come for this gathering; and, by the drying-up of the Euphrates, the way of those kings who are to come from the East is made ready. To suppose the conversion of Eastern nations, or the gathering-together of Christian princes, to be meant, or to regard the words as relating to any auspicious event, is to introduce a totally incongruous feature into the series of vials which confessedly represent 'the seven last plagues.'"

LXXX. Ver. 16. Ἁρμαγεδών.

So also Gebhardt (p. 274): "It is clear that by this name we are to understand Megiddo, which Judg. v. 19, 2 Kings xxiii. 29, 2 Chron. xxxv. 20–24 (cf. Zech. xii. 10, 11), mention as the great battlefield of the O. T. But a mere statement of locality cannot be intended, for then it would not be called Armageddon, but Megiddo or Magedon; nor would it be said that the locality was so called in the Hebrew. This addition, as well as the compound name, compels us to notice the verbal meaning, and yet not the etymological meaning of Magedon, which John, on account of its difficulty, would certainly have added in Greek (cf. ix. 11), but only that Armageddon in Hebrew means Hill

[1] Cf. on ver. 12 sqq.

[2] Beda: "The godless state brings war in three ways upon the Church; viz., through the heathen, the Jews, and the heretics." Andr.: Christians, Jews, and Samaritans in Jerusalem. Alcas.: Christians, heathen, and neutrals in Rome during the time of Constantine.

[3] Cf. Calov., etc.

[4] Beng.

[5] Hengstenb.

of Megiddo. It is in the highest degree probable, that, in this designation, the seer refers to Zech. xii. 11: 'in the Valley of Megiddo,' — valley, symbol of defeat; hill, of victory, — and wishes us to understand that what the heathen once did against Josiah and his people at Megiddo would now find its counterpart in what they did against Jesus and his followers; but that as once, in the Valley of Megiddo, the theocracy was borne to the grave with Josiah, so, in Armageddon, the Hill of Megiddo, the Lord would avenge the crime of the heathen." The point of comparison here is rather with the battle of Judg. v. 19, as Ebrard shows, and Düsterdieck seems to intimate, than with that of 2 Kings xxiii. 29, as Gebhardt states. Thomson (*Central Palestine and Phœnicia*, p. 213) explains the adoption of the local name for that of the great prophetic conflict, by the fact that the Apostle John was a native of Galilee, well acquainted with the natural features and ancient history of the great plain of Esdraelon to which it belonged. So, too, Stanley (*Sinai and Palestine*, p. 330): "If that mysterious book proceeded from the hands of a Galilæan fisherman, it is the more easy to understand why, with the scene of those many battles constantly before him, he should have drawn the figurative name of the final conflict between the hosts of good and evil from 'the place which is called, in the Hebrew tongue, Armageddon,' i.e., the city or mountain of Megiddo." See also Alford.

LXXXI. Ver. 19. *τοῦ θυμοῦ τῆς ὀργῆς.*

Cremer: "*θυμός* denotes the inward excitement, and *ὀργή* the outward manifestation of it; cf. Deut. xxix. 20; Num. xxxii. 14; Isa. ix. 19; Josh. vii. 26; 1 Sam. xxviii. 18." Trench: "The general result is, that in *θυμός* is more of turbulent commotion, the boiling agitation of the feelings, either presently to subside and disappear, or else to settle down into *ὀργή*, wherein is more of an abiding and settled habit of the mind, with the purpose of revenge." Thayer (*Lexicon*): *θυμός*, "anger forthwith boiling up, and soon subsiding; *ὀργή*, on the contrary, denotes indignation which has arisen gradually and become more settled."

CHAPTER XVII.

Ver. 3. The rec. *γέμον ὀνομάτων βλασφ.* is certainly false. It is more probable and intelligible to read, with Tisch., according to A, 7, 8, al., *γέμον τὰ ὀνόματα βλασφ.* (14, 18, al., also have *ὀνόματα*, but without the art.), than, with Lach., Tisch. IX. [W. and H.], *γέμοντα ὀνόματα βλ.* In the ℵ, the *τα* has been deleted by the corrector. But the immediately succeeding defective *ἔχοντα* has continued so to stand. W. and H.: *ἔχων.* — Ver. 4. The *καὶ* before *κεχρυσ.* (A, ℵ, Vulg., Elz., Lach., Tisch. IX. [W. and H.]), which is lacking in B (Tisch.), may be interpolated. *τὰ ἀκάθαρτα.* So A, B, ℵ, 2, 4, 6, al., Compl., Genev., Beng., Griesb., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]. The rec. *ἀκαθάρτητος* is an interpretation, as the *τῶν ἀκαθάρτων* in Areth. — Ver. 8. Instead of *ὑπάγειν* (B, ℵ, Elz., Tisch. IX.), read *ὑπάγει* (A, 12, Andr., Areth., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]). — *καὶ πάρεσται.* So A, B, 2, 3, 4, al., Compl., Plant., Genev., Beng., Griesb., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]. Incorrectly, Elz.: *καίπερ ἐστίν.* $\aleph_1$ has *καὶ πάλιν πάρεστε* (corr.: *καὶ πάρεστιν*). The *πάλιν* is an effort at interpretation; the *πάρεστε*, however, points to the correct reading. — Ver. 11. *καὶ αὐτος ὄγδ.* So A, al., edd., interpretations are: *κ. οὗτος ὀγδ.* (B), *οὗτος ὁ ὄγδ.* (ℵ), etc.

After the last plagues[1] have been inflicted, the final judgment itself follows, and that, too, in various chief acts whereby the individual chief enemies are judged successively. From ch. xii. on, as such, there are represented, first, the dragon himself, as the proper old enemy; then the beast out of the sea, i.e., the heathen-Roman secular power; finally, the beast out of the earth, serving this beast, or the false prophet. But while the description of the enemies of the Lord and his believers properly took this course, which proceeds from the original author of all antichristian hostility, from Satan himself, to the hostile powers manifesting themselves in the reality of experience by the shedding of blood and other persecutions of believers,[2] by the seduction of the inhabitants of the earth, and by blasphemy of God;[3] the reverse order follows for the description of the judgment. Satan himself — even apart from that which lies beyond xx. 3 — is at last judged,[4] and, before him, his instruments, who serve him unto the end; viz., the beast and the false prophet.[5] — But the description of the judgment is not limited to this chief feature; but just that part of the Apocalyptic picture is portrayed in a more detailed way, which refers to the antichristian secular power as in manifest reality arrayed against believers. This is now brought to view under the two forms (xvii. 3) belonging together, as they stand there in their entire opposition to God, and incur the Divine

[1] Cf. xv. 1.
[2] Cf. xiii. 7, 10, 15, xvi. 6.
[3] Cf. xiii. 4 sqq., xii. sqq., xiv. 8, xvi. 21.
[4] xx. 1 sqq.
[5] xix. 19 sqq.

judgment. Besides the Roman Empire (Welt*reiche*) as a whole, the beast, there is a particular description of the metropolis of the world (Welt*stadt*), the harlot who sits upon the beast, the concrete focus of the power of the world with all its abominations. This harlot upon the beast is now shown to the prophet[1] as the immediate object of the final judgment that now enters; and, indeed, not only what John himself beholds (xvii. 1–6), but also that which the angel says to him in interpretation of what is beheld (vv. 7–14, vv. 15–18), serves besides to represent the harlot as the completely worthy object of the judgment. To the judgment itself, then, the section xviii. 1 sqq. refers.

Vv. 1–6. One of the vial-angels allows John to see the harlot. — *καὶ ἦλθεν.* The angel had thus far occupied a standpoint adapted for the business described in ch. xvi., the pouring-out of his vials; now he comes to John in order not only to speak with him (ver. 1 sqq.), but also to carry him in spirit to another place (ver. 3). — *εἷς ἐκ τ. ἑπτ. ἀγγ., κ.τ.λ.* *One* of the seven vial-angels. Incorrectly, Eichh.: *εἷς* is equivalent to *πρῶτος*.[2] It is in no way to be conjectured which of the vial-angels it was; but that just by one of these he will be afforded a view of the judgment, is especially appropriate, because these angels have brought the last plagues immediately preceding the judgment, and that, too, without impelling the worldly kingdom to repentance.[3] — *Δεῦρο.* Cf. xxi. 9, also vi. 3, 5, 7. — *δείξω σοι τὸ κρίμα, κ.τ.λ.* The fulfilment of the promise is not immediately presented in ver. 3,[4] nor even at all in ch. xvii.; for even though in ver. 3 (*ἐρημον*), in the description of the ostentatious woman, there is an allusion to the judgment now *impending*, as also the interpreting angel, ver. 16, expressly proclaims the *future* devastation of the city symbolized by the harlot, yet neither the appearance of the woman herself, nor the interpreting speech of the angel, gives the idea of a judgment already actually present. But the angel first of all shows the harlot in her antichristian form, — which is necessary, because the special view of the city, in distinction from that of the empire as a whole, is, at least in this definite form, new, — and not until afterwards does the judgment occur (cf. xviii. 1 sqq.). — *τῆς πόρνης τῆς μεγάλης, κ.τ.λ.* From the entire presentation, especially from ver. 18, it follows that "the great harlot" is the personification of "the great city," i.e., of heathen Rome as the metropolis of the entire heathen-Roman Empire;[5] therefore the harlot is designated in like manner as previously the beast, which symbolizes the entire realm. The special description of the city is prepared already by such passages as xiv. 8, xvi. 19;[6] but the city appears as a harlot, because to this applies what has previously been said concerning it as Babylon the great (cf, ver. 2). — *ἐπὶ ὑδάτων πολλῶν.* In this also like Babylon.[7] But this sitting on masses of water, which is regarded as presenting itself to the eye of the seer, has a symbolical meaning which the angel explains in ver. 15. — *μεθ' ἧς ἐπόρνευσαν οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς.* Of all nations this was said in xiv. 8; for the masses of the inhabitants of the earth have allowed themselves to be seduced[8] in the

[1] xvii. 1 sqq.
[2] Cf. vi. 1.
[3] xvi. 9, 11, 21.
[4] Against Hengstenb.
[5] See on ver. 18.
[6] Cf. also xvi. 10.
[7] Cf. ver. 2.
[8] Cf. xviii. 3.

same way as the kings of the earth by the beast, and especially by the city wherein is the throne of the beast.[1] Accordingly it is said immediately afterwards: καὶ ἐμεθύσθησαν οἱ κατοικοῦντες τὴν γῆν, κ.τ.λ. On the suppression of the relative constr., cf. Winer, p. 141.

Vv. 3–6. The view of the harlot promised John, ver. 1 sq., is afforded after the angel has carried him away in the spirit into the wilderness. — ὑπήνεγκε με. xxi. 10. De Wette explains the idea from Luke xvi. 22; but the ἐν πνεύματι in this passage does not mention so much an actual abandonment of the body,[2] as rather that this change of standpoint has been wrought to the ecstatic consciousness of the seer by an angel.[3] — εἰς ἔρημον. The identification of this wilderness with that mentioned in xii. 6, 14, impossible in a formal respect, because of the omission of the art., coincides in Auberlen with the view that the harlot, ch. xvii., is identical with the woman, ch. xii.[4] Why the harlot, with all her ostentation, is beheld in a wilderness, the text itself indicates, ver. 16:[5] for complete desolation is impending over her.[6] Incorrect, therefore, are the explanations of the wilderness by Beda: "The absence of divinity;" Coccej.: "That part of the world wherein, at John's time, idolatry and persecution prevailed;" Bengel: "Europe, especially Italy." Incorrect also Vitr.: "Deserted of nations;" yet Vitr. has felt that the seeming contradiction between ver. 1 (καθημ. ἐπὶ ὑδάτων πολλ.) and ver. 3, in the sense of the passage already compared by him, Isa. xxi. 1, with which he improperly combines Ezek. xx. 35 (ἔρημος τῶν λαῶν), is explained, of course, not by the allegorical exposition that the wilderness, like the waters, designates many nations, but so that the sitting on the waters, i.e., the dominion over the nations (ver. 15) does not exclude the impending devastation. — θηρίον κόκκινον. That now, since the form of the harlot, i.e., of the metropolis, is so expressly distinguished from that of the beast, i e., of the empire, this beast appears in some features different from in ch. xiii., in no way destroys the identity of both beasts, clearly designated by the similarity of the chief features.[7] This identity is not definitely marked; it was just the partial change in form of manifestation that did not permit John to write ἐπὶ τὸ θηρ., but he reports his vision which revealed to him figures in a form such as in fact they had not yet appeared: He saw a woman seated upon a scarlet-colored beast. The κόκκινον designates not the color of a covering which is to be ascribed to the beast,[8] but the color of the beast itself. It is, like the fiery-red color of the dragon whom the beast serves,[9] a sign of the blood shed by it.[10] The difference from the representation, xiii. 2, is, therefore, not a proof of an actual difference of beasts, because in both forms the same thing is brought to sight; only this passage points more definitely to the blood actually shed, while in xiii. 2, in the form of the O. T. types, the dreadful power of the fierce beast,

[1] Cf. xvi. 10.
[2] Cf. 2 Cor. xii. 2.
[3] Cf. iv. 1 sqq., x. 8 sqq., xi. 1, xii. 18; var. lect.
[4] See on ver. 18.
[5] Cf. xviii. 2, 16, 19.
[6] Andr., C. a Lap., Ewald, De Wette, Hofm., Hengstenb., etc.
[7] Against Züll., Ebrard.
[8] Züll., De Wette.
[9] xii. 3; cf. vi. 4.
[10] Cf. xvi. 6, xi. 7.

as that of a monstrous beast of prey, was first symbolized. — *γέμον τὰ ὀνόματα βλασφ.* This also, as well as the succeeding description *ἔχον κεφαλὰς ἑπτὰ, κ.τ.λ.*, agrees in essentials with xiii. 1; not all of the heads of the beast, however, bear a name of blasphemy, but that the whole beast is covered with that name of blasphemy is what is now stated. The art. *τὰ ὀν.*, which has been omitted through a misunderstanding,[1] refers back to xiii. 1. The accus. *ὀνόματα* stands here with *γέμον*, for the same reason as possibly with *πεπληρωμένον*;[2] yet this construction remains remarkable, since elsewhere in the Apoc. the gen. stands with *γέμον*.[3] — The woman herself (ver. 4) appears "arrayed" (*περιβεβλ.* xii. 1) "in purple and scarlet-colored" garments.[4] The first garment[5] indicates royal sovereignty. Even the *κόκκινον* could in itself[6] have this meaning; but it is, on the one hand, superfluous by two emblems to designate the same thing; on the other hand, from the reference to ver. 3 (*θηρ. κόκκ.*), another significant interpretation of the scarlet, i.e., blood-colored, garment of the woman, excellently agreeing with ver. 6, results: both are indicated; viz., the royal dominion,[7] and the being stained with the blood of the saints.[8] Beda errs in a twofold way: "The purple of *feigned* dominion." — *κεχρυσωμένη — μαργαρίταις.* Further description of royal and most rich display.[9] The *κεχρυς.* stands zeugmatically to *λίθ. τιμ.* and *μαργ.* — *ἔχουσα ποτήριον χρυσοῦν, κ.τ.λ.* The precipitate allegoristics, which could find indicated in the words *κεχρυσ., κ.τ.λ.*, "the enticements of feigned truth,"[10] results here in arbitrary explanations: The golden cup, with its abominable contents,[11] is regarded as hypocrisy,[12] "worldly happiness, the majesty of government,"[13] "the body of words which are read in Scripture, but distorted by wicked interpretations,"[14] "the system of papal doctrine," "the cup of the mass."[15] The text allows us to think only that the harlot who renders all kings and nations drunk with the wine of her fornication[16] has a *cup* in her hand which is *golden*, just as she herself is adorned with gold and precious jewellery, but is full "of abominations," because the wine of her fornication is therein. With *γέμον* the accusat. *κ. τὰ ἀκάθαρτα* is construed[17] in the same sense[18] as the genitive *βδελ.*; but this harshness, which is the more remarkable as the genitive limitation is given in a single word, can scarcely be explained by the fact[19] that the threefold genit. *τῶν ἀκάθαρτων τῆς πορν. αὐτ.* was to be avoided. It appears, accordingly, more correct[20] to regard the accusat. *καὶ τὰ ἀκ.* parallel with the accusat. *ποτήριον, κ.τ.λ.*, and to make it depend upon the *ἔχουσα* in such a way that the words *καὶ τὰ ἀκ., κ.τ.λ.*, themselves bring later an interpretation of the *ποτήρ. χρυσ. γέμ. βδελ.* — More expressly still than the corresponding appearance does the

[1] See Critical Notes.
[2] Phil. i. 11; Col. i. 9. Winer, p. 215.
[3] Ver. 4, iv. 8, xv. 7.
[4] Cf. xviii. 16.
[5] Cf. John xix. 2.
[6] Cf. Matt. xxvii. 28.
[7] Cf. ver. 18.
[8] Against Andr., Erasm., De Wette, Hengstenb., etc.
[9] Cf. Ezek. xxviii. 13.
[10] Beda.
[11] *βδελυγμ.* Cf. Lev. xviii. 27.
[12] Beda.
[13] C. a Lap.
[14] Coccej. [15] Calov.
[16] Ver. 2, xiv. 8.
[17] Ewald, De Wette, Bleek, Hengstenb., etc.
[18] Cf. ver. 3.
[19] Hengstenb.
[20] Cf. xviii. 12.

name, which stands written on the forehead of the woman,[1] designate her lewd, abominable nature. The name runs: *βαβυλὼν ἡ μεγάλη, ἡ μήτηρ, κ.τ.λ.* The name *μυστήριον* is not the first constituent of the proper name,[2] but designates with a certain parenthetical independence, like a premised "*Nota bene*," that the name now to be mentioned is meant spiritually,[3] or in a manner accordant with revelation, not without the covering; that beneath the external brilliancy the secret nature, and, in spite of the secular dominion presented to the eyes, the unmistakable corruption of the woman, are asserted.[4] Nevertheless, the word *μυστήριον* dare not be regarded precisely as an adjective attribute to *ὄνομα*.[5] — The mysterious proper name *βαβ. ἡ μεγ.* is expressly the same as has already designated in xiv. 8, xvi. 9, the chief city as the concrete representative of the entire empire. The further designation expresses appellatively, by another change of figure, essentially what was delineated in the manifestation itself (ver. 4, *ἐχ. ποτ. χρυς.*), to which the significant name also is to correspond. As "the mother of harlots," etc., this great Babylon has shown herself by the circumstance that she has made her daughters, i.e., the cities of the Gentiles,[6] harlots, given them to drink of her own cup of abominations, and filled the whole world with her own abominations.[7] — Finally, John beholds, ver. 6, the woman in a condition to which the scarlet color of her garment, and of the beast whereon she sits, corresponds: "Drunken with the blood of the saints and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus." On the expression, cf. Plin., *H. N.*, xiv. 28: "Drunken with the blood of citizens, and thirsting the more for it;"[8] on the subject itself, cf. xvi. 6, xviii. 24. — *ἐκ τ. αἱμ.* Cf. xvi. 10, viii. 11. — *τ. μαρτύρων Ἰησ.* Cf. ii. 13. The martyrs of Jesus are not in kind distinguished from the saints; but the former designation brings into prominence the fact as to how this testimony of Jesus, which the saints have given, becomes the cause of their death.[9] — *καὶ ἐθαύμασα, κ.τ.λ.* The accus. *θαῦμα μεγα* with *ἐθαύμ.*, as xvi. 9. The ground of John's great astonishment is in general the just-described sight of the woman (*ἰδὼν αὐτην*); but in how far must this sight have occasioned such great astonishment? The most forcible reason would be that named by Auberlen, if he had the right to recognize again in the harlot the degenerate woman of xii. 1. This would, in fact, be something completely incomprehensible; but neither the angel (ver. 7 sqq.) attempts to explain this impossibility, neither does there exist anywhere else in the text an occasion for the egregious mistake of such a conception. Arbitrary, because not based upon ver. 7 sqq., are the explanations of Bengel: "John wondered, because so mighty a beast has to serve the woman in carrying her;" of Hengstenberg, who describes the astonishment of the seer as "unreasonable, foolish,"[10] because the harlot, in spite of her dreadful guilt, still maintains her greatness; of Ebrard: because the beast appears to be entirely different from in ch. xiii. The

[1] Cf. xiii. 16.
[2] Vitr., etc.
[3] Cf. xi. 8.
[4] Cf. C. a Lap., Beng., De Wette, Ewald, etc.
[5] Cf. Hofm., *O. S.*, 644.
[6] xvi. 19; Ew.
[7] Cf. xiii. 3 sqq., 14 sqq., xiv. 8 sqq., 11.
[8] More illustrations in Wetst.
[9] Cf. xi. 3, 8.
[10] Cf. also on v. 4 sqq.

angel designates in ver. 7, entirely in agreement with the *ἰδὼν αὐτὴν*, ver. 6, the *mystery* of the woman, and the beast carrying her, as the cause, to be explained by interpretation, of the astonishment of John, who himself did not understand[1] the *σημεῖον θαυμαστόν*[2] thus beheld by him.

Vv. 7–18. The interpretation of the angel (ver. 1) as to how the vision (vv. 1, 6) has manifested two chief figures, follows in two paragraphs (vv. 7–14 and vv. 15–18), which are separated by the formula *καὶ λέγει μοι*,[3] repeated in ver. 15.

Vv. 7–14. The question of the angel, *διὰ τί ἐθαύμασας*, introduces the intended interpretation just as the question of the elders (vii. 13), only that here the angel expects no answer whatever of John, but immediately himself promises: *ἐγὼ ἐρῶ σοι τὸ μυστήριον, κ.τ.λ.* This announcement marks that the two chief forms, the woman and the beast, which of course are explained each by themselves, — as they symbolize subjects that are actually different, the world-*city* and the world-*kingdom*, — nevertheless belong together essentially; there is but *one* mystery, the mystery "of the woman and of the beast." Although the woman and the beast are distinguished, the present description remains, therefore, in essential agreement with that of ch xiii. Nevertheless, the inner connection between the woman and the beast is expressed by the fact that the woman is seated upon the beast. (*τ. βασταζ. αὐτ.*, cf. ver. 3.) In perfect harmony with this is the circumstance that the beast is first (ver. 8) explained, and only then, that which is more special, which is first received from that further conception, the form of the woman. — Of the beast which John saw (ver. 3 sqq.), it is said: *ἦν καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν καὶ μέλλει ἀναβαίνειν ἐκ τῆς ἀβύσσου, κ.τ.λ.*, and this is again expressed as a foundation for the astonishment of the inhabitants of the earth:[4] *ἦν καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν καὶ πάρεσται.* This summary *πάρεσται* — which simply means "shall be," but in which an intimation of a *parousia* of the beast, to be opposed to the *parousia* of the Lord,[5] dare be sought the less as the expression *παρουσία* is lacking in the Apoc. — briefly comprehends what was previously described in such a way that also the last end of the beast again coming forth might be designated therewith (*καὶ μέλλει ἀναβ. — ὑπάγει*). Finally, the important point of the interpretation — which, of course, is not itself without mystery, but is given after the manner of xiii. 18, because of which, also, just as there, the allusion (ver. 9) is justified, in that it here pertains to an understanding endowed with wisdom — recurs for the third time in ver. 11, where, notwithstanding the more minute determination that the beast is to return in the person of a true king, yet the identity of the subject is unmistakably designated by the formulas *ὁ ἦν καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν* and *καὶ εἰς ἀπώλειαν ὑπάγει.* That explanation, therefore, is utterly mistaken, which understands the beast (ver. 11) differently from in ver. 8 (and ver. 3); in no way is the distinction possible that *τὸ θηρίον* is at one time Satan himself, and directly afterwards antichrist.[6] For the more accurate explanation of the subject, see on vv. 10 and 18. In phraseology, the genitive *βλεπόντων* in ver. 8 is remarkable.

[1] Cf. De Wette.
[2] Cf. xv. 1.
[3] Cf. the *καὶ εἶπεν μοι ὁ ἄγγ.*, ver. 7.
[4] Cf. xiii. 3, 8, 12.
[5] Beng.
[6] Against Beda, Andr., etc.

Entirely similar is the construction neither of Luke viii. 20, — where the absolute gen. λεγόντων is in meaning construed with the impersonal ἀπηγγέλη, — nor of Matt. i. 18,[1] where the absolute genitive construction μνηστευθείσης τῆς μητρός precedes, and then, by a variation of construction, the subject is derived entirely from the first member (εὑρέθη ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα), which is not modified by the parenthetical limitation πρὶν ἢ συνελθεῖν αὐτούς. In this passage, however, the definite subject οἱ κατοικοῦντες precedes, and the clause βλεπ. τ. θηρ. explains what is predicated of those κατοικοῦντες (θαυμασθήσονται), so that, according to the symmetry of the construction, only the nom. βλέποντες can be expected: but the gen. is occasioned by the gen. parenthetical clause ὧν, κ.τ.λ., even though it dare not also be said that the βλεπόντων, κ.τ.λ., is expressly construed into the relative clause.[2] The nearest indication given within ch. xvii., — which is also in harmony with ch. xiii., — for the understanding of what is said concerning the beast in ver. 8 (and ver. 11), lies in ver. 9 sq., where the seven heads of the beast are interpreted: "The seven heads are seven mountains on which the woman sitteth, and there are seven kings."[3] The seven heads, therefore, which in xii. 3, xiii. 1 sqq., — where they appeared adorned with crowns, — indicated royal sovereigns, receive here a twofold reference:[4] thereby both seven mountains and seven kings are to be understood. In connection with the heads appearing here without crowns, the first reference is without difficulty; while the other to the seven kings, which indeed is not indicated here by crowns, nevertheless finds an essentially identical foundation with xiii. 1 sqq. in the description of the regal magnificence of the woman who sits upon the beast with seven heads. But at the same time, the reference to the seven mountains on which the woman sits serves to interpret the mystery of the woman and of the beast; for if, by the woman, the *city* mistress of the world (ver. 8), of the Gentile empire forcing all inhabitants of the earth beneath her, be meant, and this city is designated as lying on seven hills, this significant point of the interpretation can be referred only to "the seven-hilled city," to Rome, just as what is said (vv. 8, 10, 11) concerning the relations of the βασιλεῖς, in complete harmony with xii. 3, xiii. 1 sqq., applies only to the Roman rulers of the world. Mysteriously, therefore, as this interpretation sounds, yet the first reference of the seven heads to the seven well-known mountains has been made prominent with the manifest intent to actually attest the interpretation promised in ver. 7. — Accordingly the seven hills are not themselves taken into further consideration; the interpretation stops (ver. 10 sq.) with the seven kings. The transferal, already mentioned on xii. 3 and xiii. 1 sqq., of the textual idea of seven βασιλεῖς, i.e., of seven *persons* who possess a kingdom, and that, too, the dominion of the world, to that of seven kingdoms or phases of the dominion of the world, depends, in Andr.

[1] Cf. Winer, p. 195. [2] Cf. De Wette.

[3] On the Hebraistic combination of the relative ὅπου with the demonstrative ἐπ' αὐτῶν, cf. xii. 6, 14.

[4] Incorrectly, Hengstenb.: "The mountains are here, as everywhere in the Apoc., meant symbolically, as a designation of kingdoms or reigns; so that consequently, by the one symbol, that of the heads, only another symbol, that of the mountains, is symbolized, and so that what is properly meant, viz., βασιλεῖς ἑπτά, should be designated.

and Beda, as well as in Hofmann, Ebrard, Hengstenb., and Auberlen,[1] upon the presumption that the "temporal-historical" explanation of Hammond, Grot., Wetstein, Eichhorn, Ewald, Lücke, De Wette, Bleek, etc., removes the biblical conception of Apocalyptic prophecy.[2] That this opposition is justified in *one* chief point, has been already referred to on xiii. 3; but exegetically incorrect, and without foundation in a further theological respect to the idea of prophetical inspiration, is the opposition to the acknowledgment of the fact that the entire force of the context allows the βασιλεῖς to be regarded only as concrete personalities, and then, that the form in general of the antichristian world-power hovering before the prophetic gaze is that of the heathen-Roman Empire. The first has been correctly understood, e.g., by Coccejus, whom Auberlen certainly will not accuse of the "temporal-historical" exposition of the Apoc., and has turned it to the advantage of his "ecclesiastical-historical" exposition: "The seven kings," says Coccejus, "are the primates of the churches of Alexandria, Jerusalem, Antioch, Constantinople, Rome, France, and Spain." On the other hand, however, many "temporal-historical" expositors cross over into the sphere of the "ecclesiastical-historical," by finding, especially in vv. 12, 16, predictions concerning the incursions of the Goths, etc.[3] That the βασιλεῖς ἑπτά are actually, as the expression declares,[4] seven persons invested with the βασιλεία, results especially from the description, ver. 10 (οἱ πέντε — ὁ εἷς — ὁ ἄλλος), and most of all from ver. 11, since here the entire sense depends upon the fact that the still future eight kings are contemplated as the *human-personal* manifestation of the whole beast. — Five of the seven kings "are fallen," i.e., dead; "the one," therefore the sixth in the series, "is," i.e., he at present possesses the βασιλεία; "the other," therefore the last of the seven, "is not yet come," he is not yet in possession of the βασιλεία, he has not yet made his appearance as βασιλεύς: but he shall come as the seventh, "and when he cometh,[5] he must continue a short space;" i.e., his dominion shall soon come to an end.[6] But the seventh is followed by yet another, the eighth (ver. 11), who cannot be symbolized by a particular head on the beast,[7] because, although connected with the seven (ἐκ τῶν ἑπτά ἐστιν), yet he has a different position from all those; he is not as one in their series, but

[1] Hofm. and Ebrard enumerate Assyria, Babylon, Persia, Macedonia, Antiochus Epiph., as the five fallen, the Roman as the present sixth kingdom. Hengstenb. and Auberlen enumerate as fallen, Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, Persia, Greece; they also regard the present sixth kingdom as the Roman. At all events, in order to correspond somewhat better with the text (Luthardt), besides the first five kingdoms, their representative sovereigns may also be named (Sennacherib, Nebuchadnezzar, Cyrus, Alexander the Great, Antiochus Epiphanes). But already in the sixth place, Luth. does not mention a definite person, but only "the Roman emperor," and then in the seventh period necessarily finds prefigured "the present period of the European system of governments." — Klief. explains upon the basis of Auberlen and Hengstenb., interpreting according to Daniel, the seven reigns as the kingdom of ten, with antichrist arising therefrom. This is the Germano-Christian kingdom of ten, by which the Roman Empire, wounded to death, is dissolved, from whose dismemberment then antichrist develops.

[2] Cf. Introduction, p. 32 sqq.

[3] Cf. Grot., etc.

[4] Cf. also ver. 12 sqq.: δέκα βασιλεῖς.

[5] ὅταν; cf. xii. 4.

[6] On the δεῖ, cf. i. 1.

[7] Against Vitr., who maintains that there is a true head of a beast, and against Hengstenb., who (as also Klief., p. 218) in the seventh head finds at the same time the eighth.

in his person is the embodiment of the beast himself; he himself is the one in whom the beast rising out of the abyss,[1] which now "is not," shall again appear, of which also it shall then be said, just as ver. 8 of the beast as such: *εἰς ἀπώλειαν ὑπάγει*, i.e., by the judgment at the Lord's coming, he shall be delivered to everlasting destruction, and thus with him, then, the beast himself shall perish. — Before the expressions made in vv. 8–11 concerning the beast and the seven (eight) kings are explained by their combination with one another, and with what is contained in xiii. 1 sqq., the meaning of the phrase *καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἑπτά ἐστιν* must be established. Hengstenb.'s explanation is incorrect: "His fate is that of the seven, viz., he must fall, he goes to ruin." Too general is the explanation that the eighth — the eighth kingdom, as it is said — is to be of the same nature as the seven.[2] But, on the other hand, the explanation which forms a decisive point in Ewald, De Wette, Volkm., Hilgenf., and the other expositors, who in the eighth king recognize the returned Nero,[3] is not compatible with the words of the text. The formula *ἐκ τῶν ἑπτά ἐστιν* is supposed to declare: "He is one of the seven." He has thus, and that, too, as one of the five fallen, already once existed, and shall return as a true king.[4] But the more peculiar the idea, the more necessary would its unambiguous expression have been; and this would have been very easy to John; he would have written, according to the linguistic usage altogether customary with him,[5] *καὶ εἰς ἐκ τῶν ἑπτά ἐστιν*. The fable of the return of Nero, which, in its actual foundations, must be regarded as far removed from xiii. 3, is also here unjustified in a simply exegetical respect. Grot. has shown the correct way,[6] by explaining the *ἐκ τῶν ἑπτά ἐστιν* with a comparison of Rom. ix. 10; Matt. i. 3, 5, 6; Luke i. 27: "The son of one of them." It is noticeable also that Andr. was led by his cultivated Greek taste to what is at least in a formal respect a similar explanation: *ὡς ἐκ μιᾶς αὐτῶν βλαστάνων*. Yet both explanations attempt too much by presupposing a text which must read: *ἐξ ἑνὸς τῶν ἑπτά ἐστιν*. All that is correct is the acknowledgment that the formula *ἐκ τῶν ἑπτά ἐστιν* expresses "descent from the seven." John does not lay emphasis upon the circumstance that the eighth arose from *one* of the seven, — although this is in fact correct, — but that he who to a certain extent, as the personification of the entire beast, corresponds to all seven, has himself his human-personal origin from these seven. The seven in their entirety are therefore contrasted with the eighth, which is the embodiment of the entire beast.[7]

The historical illustration of vv. 8–11 depends upon the presumption undoubtedly given by the context from ch. xiii., ay, already from ch. xii., that the beast is a symbol of the heathen-Roman secular power, and that the *βασιλεῖς* symbolized by the heads of the beast are not kingdoms, but royal persons, viz., Roman emperors. How these are to be reckoned, is shown

[1] Cf. xi. 7.

[2] Primas: "Lest you regard him of another class, it has been added, 'He is of the seven.'" Beng. Cf. also Vitr., etc.

[3] Cf. Hofm., who refers it to the return of Antiochus Epiphanes; also Luthardt and Ebrard, who, abandoning the idea of any express personality, substitute the restoration of the dynasty of the Seleucidae.

[4] Cf. xiii. 3.

[5] Cf. v. 5, vi. 1, vii. 13, xiii. 3, xvii. 1, xxi. 9. Cf. also John xi. 49, xiii. 21.

[6] Cf. also Hammond.

[7] Also against Hilgenf.

from ver. 8 and ver. 10, with a comparison of xiii. 3. Ch. xvii. (vv. 3, 7) also recalls the significant distinction between the numbers *seven* of the heads and *ten* of the horns, even though a new application be made here of the ten horns. Ch. xvii., however, perfectly harmonizes with ch. xiii. in the description of the seven heads in themselves, and their relation to the beast. That the beast "that was," at present "is not,"[1] and yet is, in so far as at present one of his heads, i.e., the sixth *βασιλεύς*, "is," after the five *βασιλεῖς* "are fallen," harmonizes with what is said in xiii. 3, that one of the heads was wounded to death, but was again healed. But hereby we reach the standpoint from which, looking backward, we enumerate the five fallen rulers with certainty, and at the same time, looking forward, can recognize the seventh and eighth rulers. The enumerations of Hammond and Grotius,[2] of Wetst.,[3] and of Rinck,[4] are, apart from other reasons, incorrect, partly because the subject considered is, in no way, under what individual emperor the Roman secular power shall for the first time be hostilely opposed to the Christians,[5] and partly because among the *seven* heads, the three usurpers, Galba, Otho, and Vitellius, indicated by horns,[6] dare not be reckoned — The enumeration of Roman secular rulers, intended by the writer of the Apocalypse, is not to be determined from the first, — so that it could be doubtful whether the series is to be begun with Caesar[7] or with Augustus,[8] — but from the fifth and sixth, i.e., from the point of time designated as present, in which the mortal wound of one head (viz., the fifth) appears healed, or in which, after five sovereigns have fallen, the sixth is now there. But this description[9] corresponds with the situation in which the Roman Empire was when Vespasian undertook its control, although he was not yet in indisputable possession of it. Vespasian is therefore the sixth sovereign; before him five have fallen, — Augustus, Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, and Nero; Titus follows as the seventh; the eighth, in whom the beast himself is embodied, is Domitian.

There is presented, therefore, in ver. 10 sqq. a prediction, which definitely announces beforehand certain historical circumstances. For its understand-

[1] Incorrect are all interpretations whereby the concrete historical references to the relations of the Roman Empire are avoided; as, e.g., Andr., who by the *θηρίον* (ver. 8) understands Satan, and explains: by the manifestation, especially by the death, of Christ, the beast is annihilated. Cf. Beda, C. a Lap., Zeger, etc. — Marlorat. and other Protestants interpret: "Heathen Rome is gone; Papal Rome is here, but its secular dominion is in itself nothing" (*οὐκ ἔστιν*). Cf. Luther's gloss: "The Roman Empire is, and yet is not; for it is not the whole, but, since its fall, has been reproduced by the Pope." He interprets the "one" (ver. 10) as referring to Germany; the "short space," to Spain; the beast (ver. 11), to Rome; and the ten kings (ver. 12), to Hungary, etc. In violation of the context, Weiss, p. 44, explains the idea of the being, with respect to the not being, by the designation of the antichristian nature and power, whence then what is erroneous is inferred."

[2] 1. Claudius. 2. Nero. 3. Galba. 4. Otho. 5. Vitellius. 6. Vespasian. 7. Titus. 8. Domitian.

[3] 1. Caesar. 2. Augustus. 3. Tiberius. 4. Caligula. 5. Claudius. 6. Nero. 7. Galba. 8. Otho.

[4] 1. Caligula. 2. Claudius. 3. Nero. 4. Vespasian. 5. Titus. 6. Domitian. 7. Nero. "And this applies likewise as a prophetic indefinite 'one' to the succeeding emperors until the downfall of the Roman Empire."

[5] Against Hamm., Grot., Rinck.

[6] Cf. xii. 3, xiii. 1.

[7] Cf. Sueton., *Vitae XII. Caesarum*.

[8] Cf. Tacit., *Ann.*, I. i.; *Hist.*, I. i. Lücke, p. 839.

[9] Cf. on xiii. 3.

ing,[1] it is to be remarked: 1. The chief points of the prediction — viz., that Vespasian should be succeeded by his two sons, Titus as the seventh, Domitian as the eighth ruler; that Titus will remain for a short time; and that Domitian will come forth as a personification of the entire beast — have developed upon the basis of temporal relations present in the prophet in such a way that the prophecy directed to special facts has yet nothing magical or mantic, but remains of an ethical nature. The *natural* presupposition and accommodation for the ethical genesis of the prophecy was in John the same as in Josephus, as the latter promised the government to Vespasian and his son Tiberius, even before Vespasian had decided to assume the empire.[2] How extraordinarily Vespasian, and the sons of such men like Otho and Vitellius, were esteemed in every respect, was manifest already ever since the expedition to Britain:[3] the Syrian expedition had still further increased the reputation and authority of the Flavians. But for the points of the prophecy that Titus, as successor of his father, would reign but for a short time, and that Domitian, proceeding from the seven, — a son of Vespasian, — would come forth from the abyss as an incarnation of the beast, the natural foundation was already present. Domitian's insolent, barbarous, and imperious disposition manifested itself already during the Vitellian war:[4] it was naturally to be expected that he would be just such a sovereign as he actually afterwards showed himself to be.[5] John, in prophesying a short reign for Titus, possibly expected what was always impending during his reign;[6] viz., that Domitian would soon dethrone his brother Titus, and assume the government himself. — 2. John erred in the expectation, that, with Domitian, the Roman Empire would perish. The singular error proves, of course, a certain imperfection of prophetic character in the writer of the Apocalypse, yet by no means entirely annihilates it. [See Note LXX., p. 386, on ch. xiii. 2.]

Vv. 12–17. The interpretation of the ten horns, also (ver. 15) of the waters, on which the harlot sits. In conclusion, the interpretation of the harlot herself, ver. 18, follows the interpretation of the special points. — *δεκα βασιλεῖς*. Hengstenb. errs in two ways by regarding the number *ten*, which is analogous to the number *seven*, ver. 9 sqq., as inaccurate, and the *βασιλεῖς*, again, as reigns. See, besides, on ver. 18. — *οἵτινες — θηρίον*. The limitation of *οὔπω ἔλαβον* in Grot., viz., "in the parts of the Roman Empire," is more explicit than the closing words of ver. 12. The text says that the ten kings in general have received no dominion at all; but they obtained authority as kings, and that, too, as associates and aids of the beast (*μετὰ τ.*

[1] Cf. Introduction, p. 33 sqq., 39 sqq.

[2] Josephus, *Jewish War*, iii. 8.

[3] Cf. Dio Cassius, *Hist. Rom.*, ed. Jo. Leunclav., p. 736.

[4] Cf. Sueton., *Domit.*, I.: "But he exercised the entire power of his dominion so licentiously, as then already to show what he was to be."

[5] "A pernicious tyrant," Eutrop., *H. Rom.*, VIII. 1; "A portion of Nero as to cruelty," Tertullian, *Apolog.*, 5.

[6] Sueton., *Tit.*, 9: "His brother, i.e., Domitian, not ceasing to lay plots for him, but almost avowedly inciting the army, he did venture meditating flight, either to slay or to banish, or to have even in less honor, but, as from the first day of his reign, continued to attest that he was his associate and successor, sometimes beseeching him secretly with tears and prayers, that he at length wished to live in mutual affection with him."

θηρ.; cf. ver. 13 sq.), for "one hour;" for they shall be immediately abandoned by the Lord. The very brief duration (μίαν ὥρ. accus., as ix. 5) of their rule, designated in a schematic way,[1] appears to correspond with the circumstance that of one of these kings it is said: ἐξουσ. ὡς βασιλ. The βασιλεία of these βασιλεῖς would then appear, not as a complete sovereignty, but as a quickly evanescent power, which, however, because of its temporary greatness, is represented as one that is royal.[2] — μίαν γνώμην ἔχουσιν. The words immediately following give[3] the statement that the unanimity of these kings is intended to act in concert with the beast, and that, too, first of all, against the Lord (ver. 14), but then also against the harlot (ver. 16). — μετὰ τοῦ ἀρνίου πολεμήσουσι. Here, however, there immediately follows — as the reverse of xi. 7, xiii. 7 — the statement that not only the Lamb, because he is the Lord of all lords and King of kings,[4] but even believers, shall conquer those kings. The νικήσει αυτ. suggests for the further designation of subject, καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ, κ.τ.λ.,[5] the idea of a νικήσουσι.[6] The threefold designation, according to which the saints[7] appear as those who have been called and chosen on the part of their Lord, and have, on their part, maintained their fidelity,[8] emphasizes the inner foundation of the victory, confirming the promise, and likewise calling to mind the condition of the victory.

Vv. 15-18. By a continuation of his discourse (καὶ λεγ. μ.), the angel interprets first of all the waters where John beheld the harlot, and announces then the judgment impending over the harlot, which, according to God's decree, is to be executed by the ten kings in confederacy with the beast. Then, finally, the chief figure in the vision, ch xvii., the harlot herself, is expressly explained. — τὰ ὕδατα, κ.τ.λ. The waters form the sum total of inhabitants of the earth, for they all belong to the dominion of the harlot,[9] to which also corresponds the accumulation of the four expressions, λαοί, ὄχλοι, ἔθνη, γλῶσσαι.[10] — But in spite of her wide dominion[11] and all her glory, the harlot is ruined in a manner the least to be expected, but which only the more clearly manifests the judgment of God: the ten kings, together with the beast, shall hate the harlot and annihilate all her glory. The οὗτοι μισ., as to its meaning, belongs to the kings to be understood among the horns (vv. 13, 14); these are the decisive chief subject, so that the determination of subject, besides presented in the καὶ τὸ θηρίον, does not come further into consideration with respect to the form of the expression. — ἠρημωμένην ποιήσ. αὐτ. καὶ γυμνὴν. A striking antithesis to ver. 4.[12] — κ. τὰς σάρκας αὐτῆς φάγονται. Here the idea of the form of woman is still maintained,[13] while in the following expression, καὶ αὐτὴν κατακαύσουσιν ἐν πυρί, the fundamental idea of the *city* is asserted. — Ver. 17 explains what is announced in ver. 16, by the reference to God who in this way will destroy

[1] Cf. xviii. 10.
[2] Cf. ix. 3.
[3] Cf. also ver. 17
[4] Cf. xix. 16.
[5] The στρατεύματα of the Lord, xix. 14, 19.
[6] Unnaturally, Beng.: "Those who are with him are the elect," who are only to look on.
[7] Cf. xiii. 7.
[8] Cf. ii. 10.
[9] Ver. 18. Cf. xiii. 3, 8, 12, 16.
[10] Cf. v. 9, vii. 9.
[11] Cf. ver. 1: τ. μεγάλης. xiv. 8, xvi. 19.
[12] Cf. xviii. 16.
[13] Cf. Ps. xxvii. 2; Mic. iii. 2 sqq.

the harlot: *ὁ γὰρ θεὸς ἔδωκεν, κ.τ.λ.* The view here presented is very similar to that of xvi. 14, 16: there the spirits from hell bring the kings of the earth together — for the day of judgment — at Armagedon; in this passage, the purpose and work, on God's part, are definitely expressed. He it is who has put it into their hearts to execute the will of, to make an alliance with, and to serve the beast. The thought is blunted when the *αὐτοῦ* with *ποιῆσ. τ. γνώμ.* is referred to God,[1] instead of to the beast.[2] In the connection this determination of subject is not absolutely too remote.[3] — To the *ὁ γὰρ θεὸς ἔδωκεν, κ.τ.λ.*, corresponds at the conclusion the *ἄχρι τελεσθήσονται οἱ λόγοι τοῦ θεοῦ*; the work intended by God, for the kings confederated with the beast, has in the *fulfilment* (cf. x. 7) of the words, i.e., of the prophecies of *God*, not only its goal, but also its limits. When those kings have done what they are to do, they are done away with.[4]

Now (ver. 18), upon the basis of all preceding individual statements, the precise meaning of the harlot, which is treated of especially in ver. 1, is given: the woman is "the great city," which has royal dominion over the kings of the earth, i.e., Rome, the metropolis, lying on seven hills, of the heathen-Roman Empire symbolized by the beast.

This exegetical result so undoubtedly forces itself upon us,[5] that neither the misunderstanding of Auberlen, who regards the harlot as the woman of ch. xii. degenerated, nor the old Protestant explanation, which, in a more direct way, found here a reference to the Pope and Papal Rome,[6] nor the singular opinion of Züllig, who regards the city, ver. 18, as Jerusalem,[7] needs any further refutation than that furnished by the exposition of ch. xvii. in connection with ch. xii. sqq. Especially, also, that ver. 12 sqq. cannot refer to the pressure of the Goths or other Germano-Sclavic nations, as Auberlen, in agreement this time with Grot., interprets, results already from the connection with ver. 11. The ten kings, — whom Ebrard regards as identified with the seven heads, — even if our exposition of ver. 10 sqq. and xiii. 3 be correct, can be understood neither of "the ten leaders of the Flavians,"[8] nor of the Parthian confederates of Nero.[9] But after, in vv. 3, 7, he has mentioned the ten horns, as in chs. xii. and xiii., besides the seven heads of the beast, and has also designated thereby the identity of the beast, ch. xvii., with that previously described, John now follows Dan. vii. 24 in his interpretation of the ten horns as ten "*future*" kings (*καὶ τὰ δέκα κέρατα αὐτοῦ, δέκα βασιλεῖς ἀναστήσονται*). But thereby every concrete historical relation is surrendered; just because the reference in ch. xiii. to the tenfold number of the horns is actually historical, no other can enter, and, least of all, that which actually occurs in Daniel. What is said, therefore (ver. 12 sqq.), concerning the ten kings, forms a feature in the Apocalyptic picture, derived from the Danielian model, which divests the number ten of

[1] Vulg., Hengstenb., etc.

[2] Beng., De Wette, Ew. ii., Volkm., Luthardt.

[3] Against Hengstenb.

[4] Cf. ver. 12.

[5] Cf. also Hengstenb. on ver. 18.

[6] Coccejus, Calov., Vitr., Beng.

[7] In ch. xvii., Jerusalem is regarded as Babylon; while false Judaism, under the symbol of the beast, is stated to be Edom.

[8] Wetst.

[9] Eichh., Bleek, De Wette. Cf. Ewald, who understands the Roman provincial prefects as in alliance with the returned Nero.

definite historical relation, as it makes it appear purely schematical, while the general historical presumption of John's prophetic view — with respect, on the other side, to the relative fulfilment of his prophecy — lies in the fact that the emperors, usurping authority against and after one another, could gain possession of the government only through conflicts which turned to the ruin of the city: they were with the beast, and yet desolated the licentious city. — But "the rulers of the last time"[1] are not so certainly the ten kings as the heathen-Roman world-*empire* and world-*city* are symbolized in the beast and the harlot; and it is impossible for sound exegesis to put under inspection a fulfilment of the prophecies in ch. xvii. still to occur at the end of the world. — If the ten kings be regarded more definitely and in combination with the eight rulers, we may, with Weiss,[2] refer them to the ten "regents" of the sovereign obtaining the government by the revolution of prefects (vv. 13, 17).

[1] Luthardt. [2] p. 52.

CHAPTER XVIII.

Ver. 1. The *καὶ* before *μετὰ ταῦτα* (Elz.) is, according to A, B, ℵ, al. (Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]), to be deleted; cf. vii. 1. — Ver. 2. Instead of *ἐν ἰσχύϊ, φωνῇ μεγάλῃ* (Elz., Ew. ii.), read *ἐν ἰσχυρᾷ φωνῇ*, according to decisive witnesses (Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]). — Ver. 4. In favor of *ἐξέλθατε*, A testifies (Lach. 1846, Tisch.; ℵ: *ἐξέλθεται*; Elz.: *ἐξέλθετε*); but the plural may have been written because of what follows. According to B, C, *ἔξελθε* (Lach. 1850) has at least equal authority, although even this sing. may be an emendation because of the address, *ὁ λ. μ.* — Ver. 5. Instead of the interpretation *ἠκολούθησαν* (Elz.), Beng. already wrote, according to A, B, C: *ἐκολλήθησαν* (ℵ). — Ver. 6. The *ὑμῖν* after *ἀπέδωκεν* (Elz.) is, in accordance with A, B, C, ℵ, to be deleted (Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]). Likewise the *αὐτῇ* after *διπλώσ.* — Ver. 7. Before *κάθημαι*, there is lacking, in the Rec., an *ὅτι* (A, B, C, ℵ, Lach., Tisch.). — Ver. 8. *κρίνας.* So A, B, C, ℵ$_1$, al., Beng., Griesb., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]. The *κρίνων* (Elz.) is a poor effort at interpretation. — Ver. 13. *καὶ ἄμωμον.* So A, C, ℵ, Beng., Griesb., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]. Already, in B, there is the error of an omission (Elz.). — Ver. 14. The *σου* belongs probably after *ὀπώρα* (A, C, ℵ, Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]), and not after *ψυχῆς* (B, al., Elz.). The *αὐτὰ* must stand between *οὐκέτι* and *οὐ μὴ* (B, C, Lach., Tisch.), not at the close (Elz.). ℵ has it before *εὑρησ.* (Tisch. IX. [W. and H.]). Instead of the modification *εὑρήσης* (Elz.), read, not *εὕρῃς* (B, Tisch.), but *εὑρήσουσιν* (A, C, ℵ, al., Lach. [W. and H.]). — Ver. 17. *ἐπὶ τόπον πλέων.* So A, B, C, Griesb., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]. ℵ: *ἐ. τὸν τὸπ.* The Rec. *ἐπὶ τῶν πλοίων ὁ ὁμιλος* is an unauthorized interpretation.

After, in ch. xvii., the great city has been brought to view under the *σημεῖον* of the great harlot, as the immediate object of God's judgment, whose execution is now impending,[1] there follows a description of this judgment. But this is *shown*[2] to John, not in the way, as, e.g., xxi. 9 sqq., the bride of the Lamb was shown him, — i.e., the judicial act itself whereby the city is effaced, is not presented to the gazing prophet, — but the description of the judgment is communicated in another form. In xix. 1 sqq., this is celebrated as actually completed. On the other hand, at the close of ch. xviii., there impends the actual execution (vv. 21–24);[3] also in the centre (vv. 4–20), the keynote of the description is future,[4] which is directed also here to the actually still-impending judgment. Accordingly, vv. 1–3 dare not be so understood as though the completion of the judgment were presupposed, as a matter of fact, and accordingly, that the same reference must be made also between xvii. 18 and xviii. 1; but after a mighty angel has

[1] Cf. xvii.1, xv. 1, xvi. 21.
[2] xvii. 1.
[3] Notice the future *βληθήσεται*, ver. 21.
[4] Cf. vv. 4, 6, 8, 9.

proleptically[1] proclaimed the judgment now immediately impending over the city, as has already been done, another voice sounds from heaven (vv. 4–20), which first of all commands believers to flee out of the city, whose destruction is now to be accomplished (ver. 5 sqq.), and then describes how the fall of the city will be lamented by the inhabitants of the earth. Finally, another angel (vv. 21-24) shows, by a significant act, how quickly and completely the fall of the city shall be. The proper act of judgment upon the city, which is to be regarded as afterwards between xviii. 24 sq. and xix. 1, John therefore does not *see;* but the more complete and manifest the statement in ch. xviii., the more certainly is the promise of the angel in xvii. 1 fulfilled. — It is to be observed in all three parts of the description (ch. xviii.), how not only the whole is penetrated by an agreement with O. T. models, but also, especially, how, after the manner of the ancient prophets, the threat of judgment is not expressed without repeated allusion to the guilt of sin, whereby the just wrath of God is called forth.[2]

Vv. 1–3. *ἄλλον ἀγγ. καταβαίνοντα, κ.τ.λ.* The *ἄλλον* distinguishes this angel — which can be neither Christ,[3] nor the Holy Ghost,[4] nor Luther[5] — from the one mentioned last.[6] Beng. improperly refers the *ἄλλον* also to *καταβαίνοντα*, as though this angel, coming from heaven, were contrasted with the one mentioned in x. 1; but there, as here, the *καταβ.* is an attributive determination to the idea of the subject *ἄλλ. ἀγγ.* — *ἔχοντα ἐξουσίαν μεγάλην.* The visible sign of this great plenitude of power is described immediately afterwards: *κ. ἡ γῆ ἐφωτίσθη ἐκ τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ*, without any more specific statement as to in what way this *δόξα* has come to manifestation.[7] But for the exceedingly important proclamation which is announced in ver. 2 sqq., an exalted angel is prepared, who, with the brilliancy of his heavenly glory, shines forth over the whole earth (ver. 2: *ἔκρ. ἐν ἰσχυρᾷ φωνῇ*),[8] and cries with such a mighty voice that his message resounds throughout the whole earth,[9] as far as the dominion of the city that has incurred the judgment extends. — *ἔπεσεν*, cf. xiv. 8. — *ἐγένετο κατακοιτήριον δαιμόνων — μεμισημένου.* In the sense of Isa. xiii. 22, xxxiv. 14 sqq., and Bar. iv. 35, it is rendered clear, that the stately city shall be entirely desolated. On the *φυλ. παντ. ὀρνέου, κ.τ.λ.*, cf. Jer. l. 39; Zeph. ii. 14; Ps. cii. 7. Even in respect to the description (ver. 2), the allegorical exposition has been attempted; even Ebrard understands the "birds" spiritually. — The expression *φυλακὴ* signifies that the desolated *κατοικτήριον* is one received involuntarily, a prison.[10] — *ὅτι, κ.τ.λ.* Declaration of the guilt of sin as the foundation of the judgment.[11] — *καὶ οἱ ἔμποροι, κ.τ.λ.* Not only is the sin of godless, gluttonous, and arrogant wantonness punished,[12] but at the same time the contrast is marked between the complete desolation and the former wantonness which had within reach such means that the merchants of the whole earth were thereby enriched.[13] The

[1] Cf. xi. 15–19, xiv. 8.
[2] Cf., already, xiv. 8, 15 sqq., xvi. 5, 19.
[3] Calov., Hengstenb.
[4] Coccejus, Vitr.
[5] Nicolai, etc. Cf. Calov.
[6] xvii. 1, 7, 15.
[7] Cf. x. 1, i. 14 sqq.
[8] Cf. v. 2.
[9] Ver. 2: *ἔκρ. ἐν ἰσχυρᾷ φωνῇ.* Cf. v. 2.
[10] Ii. 10, xx. 7; Beng., Hengstenb.
[11] Cf. xiv. 8, xvii. 2.
[12] Cf. vv. 7, 9.
[13] Cf. vv. 11, 23

ἐκ τῆς δυνάμεως τ. στρήν. does not mean "because of the abundance of luxury,"[1] also not "because of their great wantonness,"[2] but refers to the wantonness exercised with respect to the vast resources of the state.[3]

Vv. 4–20. Another voice from heaven — scarcely that of God or Christ,[4] because the discourse extending until ver. 20, and even presenting from ver. 9 the grievance of another, is not appropriate to the mouth of God or Christ, but of an angel, who[5] speaks in the name of God — first of all commands those who belong to the people of God to leave the city given over to destruction: ἵνα μὴ συγκοινωνήσατε, κ.τ.λ.[6] The ἁμαρτίαις αὐτῆς[7] is not to be taken by metonymy for the *punishments* of sin;[8] but the idea is,[9] that fellowship in the sins of the city, which indeed is not a fellowship of guilt, yet will be a fellowship of punishments (κ. ἐκ τ. πληγῶν, κ.τ.λ.). [See Note LXXXII., p. 449.] For the idea that God's believers, whether under compulsion,[10] or in consequence of an increased temptation,[11] could actually share in the sins of the great city, is here scarcely justified, since the judgment unmistakably befalls them. Believers would share in the destruction occurring because of the sins of the city, which now (ver. 5) have reached the highest limit: ὅτι ἐκολλήθησαν, κ.τ.λ., i.e., the sins — not the cry thereof — have accumulated to so monstrous a degree that they reach even to heaven.[12] On the expression κολλᾶσθαι — ἄχρι τ. οὐρ., literally *belong* even to heaven, cf. Bar. i. 20,[13] Ps. lxiii. 9,[14] and similar examples in Biel, *Thes.* — ἐμνημόνευσεν, cf. xvi. 9.

Vv. 6–8. Now the one speaking in God's name[15] turns to those who are to execute his judgment of wrath upon the great city: ἀποδότε αὐτῇ, κ.τ.λ. She is to be rewarded,[16] and that, too, doubly;[17] i.e., she is to suffer for her sins, now the corresponding, entirely complete punishment; and just as she had glorified herself, and lived in arrogant wantonness, so is there now much pain and sorrow to be given her.[18] The determination of the degree (ver. 7), ὅσα — τοσοῦτον,[19] which expresses the idea of strict justice, throws the true light upon the more rhetorical presentation in διπλώσατε, διπλᾶ, διπλοῦν. Even at the beginning (ἀπόδοτε, κ.τ.λ.), the equality of guilt and punishment was designated;[20] the very expression ἀπέδωκεν is explained by the fact that it is to correspond to the ἀπόδοτε αὐτῇ. — The transformation of proud security into the deepest sorrow represented in striking antithesis (ver. 7*a*) is further intensified by what succeeds in ver. 7*b* and ver. 8. As the foundation of the ὅσα ἐδόξασεν, the arrogant speech which the woman carries in her heart, is stated: she boasts, because of her sovereignty over the world,[21] that "she

1 Ewald.
2 De Wette, Hengstenb.
3 Cf. also Andr., Grot., Vitr.
4 Beng., Hengstenb.
5 xi. 3.
6 Cf. Jer. li. 6, 9, 45.
7 Cf. ver. 5, αἱ ἁμαρτ. and τ. ἀδικήμ. αὐτ.
8 Beng., De Wette.
9 Cf. Gen. xix. 15. Hengstenb.
10 Ew. ii.
11 Luthardt.
12 Cf. Ez. ix. 6. Beng.
13 ἐκολλήθη εἰς ἡμᾶς τὰ κακὰ.
14 ἐκολλ. ἡ ψυχή μου ὀπίσω σου.
15 Cf. the final formula, ver. 8.
16 Cf. xvi. 5 sqq., xiv. 8 sqq., xi. 18.
17 Cf. Isa. xl. 2.
18 Cf. Am. viii. 10.
19 On the form of the expression, cf. Rom. vi. 10; Gal. ii. 20.
20 ὡς καὶ αὐτὴ ἀπέδ. Cf. xiv. 10.
21 Cf. xvii. 18.

is enthroned as a queen,[1] not as a widow," but, as a prolific mother, she is the mistress of many cities[2] and nations,[3] and is confident that she "shall never see sorrow," i.e., learn to know it by experience,[4] especially by the death of her children.[5] But in sharp contrast with this confident pride is opposed the threatening occasioned by it:[6] on "*one day*"[7] shall her plagues come, and that, too, not only "*death*," which makes her a widow, but also "*mourning*," which she thought that she would never experience, and *hunger*, instead of her inordinate luxury. — *καὶ ἐν πυρὶ κατακ.* Cf. xvii. 16. — *ὅτι ἰσχυρὸς, κ.τ.λ.* The pledge for the infallible execution of the threat; cf. i. 8.[8] — *ὁ κρίνας αὐτήν.* Incorrectly interpreted by the poor var., *κρίνων*. For the judgment is already fulfilled to such an extent that in the threat just expressed, the punishment on the part of the judge is already determined.

Vv. 9–20. Now the kings and other inhabitants of the earth lament for the rash pride of the great city, whereby they also are painfully affected.[9] Yet in vv. 11 and 17, a similar change in form of statement occurs, as in xi. 11 compared with xi. 7.

Ver. 9 sq. The lament of the kings of the earth.[10] Cf. xiv. 11. The *βασανισμός* of the city, through which they are affected by the judgment, is its actual *πυρῶσις*.[11] Accordingly the lamenting kings stand at a distance: they dread the conflagration in which the city perishes.[12] — *Οὐαί, οὐαί.* With the *διπλώσατε*, ver. 6, the repetition of the cry of woe, which corresponds only to the extremity of the pain,[13] has nothing to do.[14] — *ἡ πόλις ἡ μεγάλη, κ.τ.λ.* The allusion to the greatness and power of the city[15] makes still more forcible the impression of its destruction, which is expressly designated as the reason for the lamentation (*ὅτι, κ.τ.λ.*).

Vv. 11–16. The lament of the merchants. — *κλαίουσιν καὶ πενθοῦσιν.* — By the present, John passes over to the tone of narration;[16] but does not choose here as yet the preterite,[17] so that he still does not express the idea that he himself had observed the destruction of the city, or the accompanying lamentations. The easier afterwards is the return to the original course (ver. 15); but the recent transition to the narrative brings finally with it also the preterites (ver. 17 sq.). — *τὸν γόμον.* The cargo.[18] — The entire description of the many precious things, for which the merchants can no more find purchasers, gives a view of the previous necessities of the luxurious[19] city. The mass of different things are mentioned with suitable grouping — *σηρικοῦ.* Silk.[20] — *καὶ πᾶν ξύλον θύϊνον, κ.τ.λ.* The alternation of accusatives and genitives dependent upon the *τὸν γόμον* until the close of ver. 13, which is here presented very

[1] Cf. Isa. xlvii. 7.
[2] Cf. xvii. 5.
[3] Cf. Isa. xvii. 8.
[4] John viii. 51 sqq.
[5] *πένθος*, lamentation for the dead. Cf. Gen. xxvii. 41, l. 10 sqq.; Am. viii. 10. Ew. ii.
[6] *διὰ τοῦτο*, like the ancient prophetical לָכֵן, e.g., Mic. ii. 2, iii. 61; Am. iii. 11, v. 13, 16.
[7] Cf. Isa. xlvii. 9.
[8] Am. iv. 13, v. 27.
[9] Cf. Ezek. xxvii.
[10] Cf. xvii. 2.
[11] Cf. i. 15.
[12] Cf. ver. 15.
[13] Cf. vv. 16, 19.
[14] Against Hengstenb.
[15] Cf. ver. 11 sqq., xix. 21 sq.
[16] De Wette.
[17] Cf. xi. 11.
[18] Acts xxi. 3. Cf. Eustath. in Wetst.: *φόρτος νηὸς, ὁ καὶ γόμος.*
[19] Ver. 3: *τ. στρήνους αὐτ.*; vv. 7, 9. Cf. xvii. 4.
[20] Cf. Winer, *Realw.*, on this word.

definitely, may serve as an explanation of the ambiguous construction, xvii. 4. — The precious, sweet-scented thyine wood,[1] the "*citreum*" of the Romans, comes from the tree called *θύον*, *θύα*, *θύϊα*, which is possibly identical with the white cedar (*cupressus thyioides*).[2] — The expression *πᾶν ξύλ. θύ.* designates, first of all, the collected precious material;[3] upon this follows the enumeration of the vessels made from the precious material, under which is *σκ. ἐκ ξύλου τιμ.* — *κινάμωμον.* Cinnamon.[4] — *ἄμωμον.* The precious hair-ointment procured from an Asiatic shrub.[5] — *σεμίδαλιν.* Finest wheat-flour, "*simila*"[6] or "*similago.*"[7] — *κτήνη.* The general expression, which includes also horned cattle,[8] precedes. — *ῥεδῶν.* A kind of four-wheeled vehicle.[9] Alexander Sev. furnished the Roman senators with such vehicles, decorated with silver, — "thinking that it pertained to the Roman dignity, that senators of so great a city should be carried therein."[10] — *σωμάτων*, i.e., slaves, *σώματα δοῦλα*[11] See examples from the LXX. in Biel.[12] The following expression *ψυχὰς ἀνθρώπων*[13] also points to the slaves, and because of the difference in the construction — the *γόμον* being understood with the genitive — it seems that a distinction is intended to be made.[14] The most probable[15] explanation is that which understands the *σωμ.* as referring to such slaves as belong to the horses and chariots, and the latter expression, *ψυχ. ἀνθρ.*, as referring to slaves in general. So, too, in ver. 17, Ew. ii. understands, in the last place, female slaves. Volkm., who gives a false emphasis to the *καὶ* before *ψυχ. ἀνθρ.*,[16] finds here the judgment given by the Christian spirit, that transactions in the slave-trade are not concerning the "bodies," but the "souls," of men. But it is nevertheless correct, that, according to the heathen view, the slaves are considered only as *σώματα*; the *ψυχ. ἀνθρ.* also receives a certain importance from the fact that it concludes a short paragraph. Yet the explanation of Volkmar, with respect to the change of construction, seems to me impossible. — The lamentation in ver. 14[17] turns to

[1] Luther.

[2] Cf. Wetst. and Winer, *Realwb.*, on the word.

[3] Against De Wette: "All sorts of vessels made therefrom." Cf. Hengstenb.

[4] Luth. Cf. Winer, *Realwb.*, on this word, and Zimmt.

[5] Plin., *H. N.*, xii. 23. Cf. Martial, viii. 77: "Assyrio semper tibi crinis amomo splendeat" [May thy hair always shine with the Assyrian *amomus*]. See Wetst.

[6] Vulg.

[7] Cf. Plin., *H. N.*, xviii. 20: "Similago ex tritico fit laudatissima."

[8] See lexicons.

[9] Isidor., xx. 17.

[10] Lamprid. in Wetst.

[11] Pollux, III. 71.

[12] Cf. Wetst., Wolf, etc.

[13] Ezek. xxvii. 13. Cf. 1 Chron. v. 21.

[14] Cf. Wetst., who refers the *ψυχ. ἀνθρ.* to gladiators; Züll., who refers *σώμ.* to proper slaves, *ψυχ. ἀνθρ.* to such as are hired also for lust.

[15] Cf. Beng., Ewald, Hengstenl.

[16] "Aye, souls of men."

[17] Vitr. has thought, with Beza and Laun., that ver. 14 belongs not to this place, but between vv. 23 and 24. Ew. i. regards the verse as a marginal note of John, who did not immediately find a suitable place for the thought. Ew. ii. concedes it to be possible, that the verse is here derived from an entirely different book; but if it belong to the Apoc., he would introduce it in the midst of ver. 23. Cf. also Volkm. But even though the form of the address giving offence could not be understood as the lament of the merchants, — this does not follow until ver. 15 sqq., in a manner corresponding to ver. 10, — it must be decided, nevertheless, that the interpreting angel (Bleek), or the voices interposed in ver. 4, directly address the city now lamented and threatened. A similar alternation in the form of description occurs also in ver. 22 sqq., in comparison with vv. 21 and 24. Cf. also Hos. ii. 8.

the objects that have served another chief class of the *στρῆνος* of the great city, daintiness and gluttony; this part of the description, by its description of the punishment, calls to mind the corresponding guilt of sin. — *ἡ ὀπώρα σου τῆς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς ψυχῆς*. Excellently, Luther, who also describes, with correct meaning, the genitive limitation to *ἡ ὀπώρα*: *das Obst, da Deine Seele Lust dran hatte.*[1] — *ὑπῆλθεν ἀπὸ σοῦ*. In the same sense as the parallel *ἀπόλετο ἀπὸ σοῦ*. Cf. Ps. cxlii. 5. LXX. — *τὰ λιπαρὰ*. Properly "the fat," but its combination with *τὰ λαμπρὰ* points to the fact that the expression is to be taken[2] in the ordinary improper sense.[3] Every thing pre-eminent and glorious, in its class, is finally grouped together. — The two last verses, which refer to the lamentation of the merchants, establish the conformity with ver. 9 sqq., which could not as yet be attained because of vv. 11–14; also in the two points that the merchants appear standing at a distance and raising the express cry of lamentation. The *τούτων*, ver. 15, corresponding to this, refers not only to those of ver. 14,[4] but to all things mentioned by ver. 11,[5] so that there is no reason to censure the discourse for inconcinnity.[6] —*κόκκινον*. That the scarlet raiment here,[7] like the purple, indicates the royal glory of the city, is self-evident in the impression of the merchants. By those who neither see nor understand the scarlet beast, only such an idea of the woman is presupposed, as she corresponds in harmonious connection with the view of the luxurious glory of the city granted the prophet in ch. xvii.

Vv. 17–19. The lament of the shipmasters, which likewise contains the three points of ver. 9 sq. and vv. 11–16: the standing afar off of those lamenting, the remembrance of the city's former glory, and the cry of woe over its destruction. — On the preterite forms of statement (*ἔστησαν*, ver. 17, *ἔκραζον*, vv. 18, 19), from which, however, according to the plan of the entire description, ch. xviii., it is not to be inferred that John actually beheld the fall of the city, cf. on ver. 11, and the preliminary note on ch. xviii.

All classes of mariners are mentioned, just as, ver. 11 sqq., all classes of merchants were indicated: "pilots," and *πᾶς ὁ ἐπὶ τόπον πλέων*, i.e., not exactly the "coasters,"[8] but those who regularly sailed to a definite harbor;[9] and *ναῦται*, i.e., "mariners" in general; and, as it is finally said, "as many as work the sea," i.e., all those for whom the sea is the sphere of their calling and the source of livelihood; fishermen also belong to this category. On the expression common in the classics, *τὴν θάλ. ἐργάζεσθαι*, "to work the sea," cf. many examples in Wetst. — *καπνὸν τ. πυρ.* Cf. ver. 9. — The question of lamentation, *τίς ὁμοια τῇ πόλει τῇ μεγάλῃ;* is likewise a sarcastic allusion to the former self-deification of the metropolis of the empire.[10] — *ἔβαλον χοῦν, κ.τ.λ.* Cf. Ezek. xxvii. 30. Concerning this sign of grief, cf. Winer, *Rwb.*, on the word. — *ἐν ᾗ ἐπλούτησαν, κ.τ.λ.* The city was the place where all mariners

[1] ["The fruit in which thy soul had pleasure."]

[2] Luther, Bengel, Hengstenb.

[3] Isa. xxx. 23. Cf. Hesych., who explains λιπ.: καλόν, ἔλαφρον, κ.τ.λ. [beautiful, easy, etc.].

[4] De Wette.

[5] Beng.

[6] Against De Wette.

[7] Cf., on the other hand, xvii. 4.

[8] De Wette.

[9] Beng., Hengstenb., etc. Cf. Acts xxvii. 2.

[10] Cf. xiii. 4.

with their manifold wares had found a rich and productive market; for, because of its precious treasures,[1] the city was able to become the source of wealth to all dealers. (ἐπλούτ. — ἐκ τῆς τιμιότητος αὐτ. Cf. ver. 3. — ἠρημώθη.) Cf. xvii. 3. [See Note LXXXIII., p. 449.]

Ver. 20. The heavenly voice — not John,[2] to whom this demand is not well adapted[3] — exhorts not only heaven (together with all who dwell therein, xii. 12), but also all who on earth belong to the Lord, to joy over the city thus perishing. Earthly believers — who are exhaustively enumerated by the three categories *οἱ ἅγιοι*, *οἱ ἀπόστολοι*, and *οἱ προφῆται*,[4] in which the most general conception precedes, and then two particular classes are mentioned, because they, being first attacked by the hatred of the secular power,[5] have an especial reason to rejoice over the vengeance inflicted by God's judgment — are mentioned besides "heaven," because it is intended to express that to the entire number of those who belong to the Lord,[6] the destruction of the city is a joyful proof of the righteousness and glory of their God. — ὅτι ἔκρινεν, κ.τ.λ. This fact, upon which the lamentation of the inhabitants of the earth is based,[7] is the foundation of the joy of all the saints. But also in the phraseology, this diversity of relation is marked; the judgment of God, which the city has incurred,[8] has brought about a *κρίμα*. i.e., an act fulfilled by the *κρίνειν*, which[9] is called a judgment of believers (*κρ. ὑμῶν*), since this judgment executed in the city, taken upon her (*ἐξ αὐτῆς*),[10] is the justification and satisfaction of those believers persecuted by the worldly city, but now avenged on it.

Vv. 21-24. Finally, a mighty angel in representing the impending sudden destruction of the great city, by casting a great stone into the sea, not only in his speech explaining this symbolical act, describes, by individual vivid features, the transformation into desolate silence of the pleasure and magnificence that have hitherto prevailed, but also points definitely to the guilt of the city as the ground of the judgment.

εἷς ἄγγελος ἰσχυρός. On *εἷς* in the indefinite sense, cf. viii. 13. The might of the angel is especially emphasized, because this is demanded for his action.[11] — *λίθον ὡς μύλινον μέγαν*. By the comparison *ὡς μύλ. μέγ.*, the greatness of the stone is illustrated.[12] The meaning of the act[13] is described well by Andr., since he holds to the literal interpretation of the angel: *καθάπερ, φησὶν, ὁ μύλος καταδύει ὁρμήματι εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, οὕτω καὶ ἡ τῆς βαβυλῶνος ταύτης ἀθρόον ἔσται καθαίρεσις, ὥστε μήτε ἴχνος αὐτῆς φυλαχθῆναι εἰς τὸ μετέπειτα.*[14] Here it is likewise remarkable that Andr. does not see that he is led to substitute for the

[1] Cf. ver. 16.

[2] Züll.

[3] Cf. xii. 12.

[4] Cf. xi. 18.

[5] Cf. ver. 24.

[6] For critical inferences this passage is not adapted. With the same justice with which it would be inferred that John does not belong to the apostles, we may also conclude that he does not belong to the prophets. — The state of the case is different, however, in xxi. 14.

[7] Vv. 10, 16, 19.

[8] Ver. 8: *κρίνας αὐτήν*; the aor., as in this passage, *ἔκρινεν*. Ver. 10: *ἡ κρίσις σου*.

[9] Cf., on the other hand, xvii. 1, where the harlot was designated as the direct object.

[10] Cf. vi. 10.

[11] Cf. v. 2, xviii.

[12] Cf. xi. 1, viii. 8.

[13] Cf. Jer. li. 63 sqq.

[14] ["Just as, he says, the millstone sinks by its impulse into the sea, so also the destruction of this Babylon shall be all at once, so that not a trace of it shall be preserved for posterity."]

expression *ὁ μύλος*, which is unusual as a designation of a millstone, that which is ordinarily employed, and how he correctly paraphrases the *ὁρμήματι*[1] by *ἀθρόον*. — Concerning *οὐ μὴ* with aor. subj., ver. 21 sqq.,[2] see Winer, p. 471. — The description, ver. 22 sqq., which refers not only to objects of pleasure and luxury, but also to daily wants and natural relations of life, has the model of Ezek. xxvi. 13, Jer. xxv. 10,[3] as its foundation; the *ἐρήμωσις* of the city (vv. 16, 19, xvii. 16)[4] is illustrated in a concrete way. — *πᾶς τεχνίτης πασ. τέχνης.* The exhaustive conclusion of the category, of which several individual examples are mentioned.[5] — *ὅτι οἱ ἔμποροι σου, κ.τ.λ.* Very suitably, the discourse of the angel concludes with a definite presentation of the guilt of the city. This, however, is stated in a threefold way from ver. 1 on:[6] first, the unprecedented luxury in which the city had indulged, because of its wealth;[7] then the licentiousness into which she had led astray all nations and kings, as she brought all the world thither to her service and to acknowledge her as the divine queen;[8] finally, her bloody hostility to the saints.[9] All three points[10] the angel emphasizes, sealing, as it were, his announcement of judgment with this establishment of guilt; the first, in the words *ὅτι οἱ ἔμποροί σου ἦσαν οἱ μεγιστᾶνες τῆς γῆς*,[11] "because thy merchants were the great men of the earth," i.e., because they who brought thee the objects of thy luxurious life found in thy wealth and extravagance a source of their own wealth, which made them the great men of the earth;[12] the second, in the words *ὅτι ἐν τῇ φαρμακείᾳ σου, κ.τ.λ.*, which cannot be understood as a foundation of what immediately precedes,[13] but are co-ordinate with the first expression *ὅτι οἱ ἔμποροι, κ.τ.λ.*, since here the same object is described as in xvii. 2, 4, and the seductive sorcery[14] is in fact nothing else than the intoxicating wine of the harlot. The most important third point of the guilt is finally emphasized with especial force, ver. 24, by the change in the form of the discourse. Not in an apostrophe to the city, but in a judgment of firm objectivity, it is here finally established that in the city the blood of prophets and of saints, and of all those slain upon earth (for Christ's sake), "was found." In an exquisite manner the *εὑρέθη* indicates how the blood, which has been shed "upon the earth," was reckoned "to the city." The city is the capital of the entire empire, hating and murdering believers; as a matter of fact also, in the Neronian universal persecution, it took the lead of its empire. — In violation of the context, Ew. ii. understands the *πάντ. τ. ἐσφ., κ.τ.λ.*, of those not Christians.

[1] Cf. Matt. viii. 32 with its parallels.
[2] Also ver. 7.
[3] Cf. vii. 34, xiv. 9, xxxiii. 11.
[4] Cf. Jer. vii. 34.
[5] Cf. vv. 14, 17.
[6] Cf. ch. xvii.
[7] Vv. 3, 7, 11 sqq.
[8] Cf. vv. 3, 6 sq., 9, xvii. 2.
[9] Cf. xvii. 6.
[10] Cf. Ewald.
[11] Cf. Isa. xxiii. 8.
[12] Cf. vi. 15. So Ewald, De Wette, Hengstenb., etc. Eichh. improperly regards the *οἱ ἔμπ. σου* as the predicate, as he besides regards "the merchandise" as a figurative designation for "fornication."
[13] Against Hengstenb.
[14] *φαρμακεία* refers to the love-potions of the harlot. Cf. Isa. xlvii. 9, 11 sqq. Ewald, De Wette.

Notes by the American Editor.

LXXXII. Ver. 4. *συνκοινωνήσατε ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις.*

Participation both in the sins, i.e., in the guilt, and in the punishment, is, however, expressly mentioned. As Ebrard and Hengstenberg note, there is an explicit antithesis between *ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις* and *τῶν πληγῶν*. Besides, where there is no guilt, there is no real punishment, except in that one case of the vicarious suffering of Him who assumed our guilt. The chastisements of the believer are not punishments, but blessings. Lange is therefore right when he takes exception to our author's interpretation, and adds: "A guiltless participation in punishment would certainly be akin to propitiatory suffering. Fellowship with the sinner, however, on an equal moral footing, without the re-action of discipline, chastisement, excommunication, is fellowship in his guilt. Hence the *πληγαί* are not simply strokes: they are deserved strokes. See Josh. vii.; Num. xvi. 21–24.

LXXXIII. Vv. 11–16.

Alford suggests a difficulty which he confesses himself unable to answer, that Rome never has been, nor can be, a great commercial city; and that this description, based on the lament over Tyre in Ezek. xxvii., would be better adapted to London than to Rome. Contrast Rome, however, with Jerusalem, and its relative pertinency becomes manifest. In addition, the metropolis may be here regarded as the impersonation of all the luxury of the whole empire. The reading of chapter i. of Farrar's *Early Days of Christianity* will throw light upon this point.

CHAPTER XIX.

Ver. 1. *ὡς φωνὴν μεγάλην ὄχλου πολλοῦ.* So already Beng., Griesb., according to decisive witnesses. So also *λεγόντων* (Elz.: *λέγοντος*). The reading *τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν* (Elz.: *κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ ἡμ.*) is also indisputable (Griesb., Lach., Tisch.). — Ver. 5. *τῷ θεῷ.* So A, B, C, ℵ, Beng., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]. The accus. (Rec.) is a modification. — Ver. 6. The Rec. *λεγόντων* (Lach., Tisch. IX.) [bracketed by W. and H.] has, indeed A and other witnesses in its favor, but is subject to suspicion as a modification (ℵ: *λεγούσων*). More probable is the reading *λέγοντας* (2, 12, 16, al., Beng.); but what commends itself to most, just because of its incorrectness, is the nom. *λέγοντες* (B, 4, 7, 8, Tich., Tisch.); cf. the *δώσωμεν* in 11 (Wetst.). — Ver. 9. The art. *οἱ* before *ἀληθινοὶ* (A, Beng., Lach., Tisch.) is probable; certainly the *εἰσιν* belongs to the close. ℵ$_1$ has *οὗτ. οἱ λόγ. μου ἀληθ. εἰσ. τ. θ.*, but corr. *λόγ. τ. θ. ἀλ. εἰσ*; so Tisch. IX. — Ver. 12. The *ὡς* before *φλοξ* (Elz., Lach.) is indorsed by A, al., Vulg., but may have been interpolated as a modification; cf. i. 14. It is wanting in B, ℵ, al. (Beng., Tisch. [W. and H.]). — The addition between *ἔχων* and *ὄνομα* of *ὀνόματα γεγραμμένα καὶ*, adopted by Tisch. 1859, and not by IX., has too little authorization from B, min., Syr. (against A, min., Vulg., Orig., al.). The plural alone also occurs (ℵ corr.; cf. also Wetst.). Why it has sometimes been regarded more suitable, is to be seen in Andr., who presupposes the sing. (*τὸ ἄγνωστον τοῦ ὀνόματος*), and remarks: Christ has many names if the subject be with respect to his various revelations; but, as to his nature, he is ineffable (*ταῖς γὰρ οἰκονομίαις ὢν πολυώνυμος, ὡς ἀγαθός, ὡς ποιμὴν, ὡς ἥλιος, κ.τ.λ.; τῇ οὐσίᾳ ἐστὶν ἀνώνυμος καὶ ἀνέφικτος.* [For being in his administrations many-named, as Good, Shepherd, Sun, etc., but in essence without name and beyond reach]). — Ver. 13. Instead of *καλεῖται* (Elz., Beng.), read *κέκληται* (A, B, ℵ, al., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]). — Ver. 19. Before *πόλεμον*, the art. *τὸν* is to be inserted in the Rec. (A, B, ℵ, Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]).

The judgment over the great harlot, i.e., the great city, is now actually fulfilled.[1] But just as the casting of the arch-enemy from heaven, the first proof of the Divine victory over antichrist, was celebrated with a loud song of praise,[2] so now also heavenly hallelujahs resound, since the first act of the final judgment over the antichristian powers in the service of Satan has been accomplished (vv. 1–8). A direct reference to the blessed fulfilment of the mystery of God,[3] the glory prepared for believers, is immediately connected with this (ver. 9 sq., cf. ver. 7); for the pre-requisite for the entrance of that glory, the conquest of the antichristian enemies, is comprised already in the fulfilment. — The development of a catastrophe so long prepared, once begun, now, however, proceeds quickly to a still greater

[1] Cf. the preliminary remarks on ch. xviii. [2] xii. 10. [3] Cf. x. 7.

extent: the Lord himself, a just Judge and almighty Victor, goes forth with his heavenly hosts to the annihilation of the entire antichristian empire, besides all kings and nations belonging thereto; the beast from the sea, and the false prophet, are cast alive into the lake of fire, and the inhabitants of the earth are slain with the sword which proceeds out of the mouth of the Lord, and serve as food for fowls.

Vv. 1–8. The ascription of praise to God on the part of those who dwell in heaven is made in songs, which properly now change to a far richer fulness (ver. 1 sq., ver. 3, ver. 4, ver. 5, ver. 6 sq.) than previously.[1]

Vv. 1, 2. ἠκουσα ὡς φωνὴν μεγάλην ὄχλου πολλοῦ. "I heard" (something) "like a great voice of a large multitude." The ὡς, κ.τ.λ.,[2] states, by way of comparison, that the sound perceived by John became as loud as though a great multitude of men had made their voice sound powerfully (cf. ver. 6). Incorrectly, Beng., Hengstenb., etc., who by the ὄχλ. πολλ. wish those named in xviii. 20 to be recognized. Ew. ii. refers it, just as xii. 10–12, to the glorified martyrs. — Ἀλληλούϊα. The leading tone of this song, resounding repeatedly (vv. 3, 4, 6), is marked from the very beginning as that of an exalted ascription of praise. It is certainly not unintentional, that just here, after the complete judgment upon the enemies of God and of his believers has already begun, the express hallelujah is found, which does not occur elsewhere in the Apoc.[3] The *four*fold repetition, however, is not to be pressed, at least in the sense of Hengstenb.,[4] because it is not the victory over the earth, but that over the harlot, that is celebrated. — ἡ σωτηρία, κ.τ.λ. Cf. vii. 10, xii. 10. — ὅτι ἀληθ., κ.τ.λ. Foundation of the praise in the righteousness of the Divine judgments in general;[5] there follows[6] the concrete foundation in the judgment just fulfilled, whose justice is expressly emphasized.[7]

Ver. 3. Further raising of the song of praise on the part of those who have sung in ver. 1 sqq., a sort of antistrophe to the preceding strophe.[8] — καὶ ὁ κάπνος, κ.τ.λ. The point in the ascription of praise, referring to xviii. 8 (κατακαυθ., cf. xviii 9, 18), may accordingly enter in the form of the connective (καί), because the song, ver. 3, is an amplification of the ascription of praise, ver. 1 sq.

Ver. 4. The twenty-four elders and the four beings, responding first of all by the Ἀμήν, confirming the ascription of praise just proclaimed, then also, on their part, expressly continue the same: ἀλληλ.[9]

Ver. 5. ἀπὸ τοῦ θρόνου. "Out of the throne." It does not follow that the voice is that of Christ who sits upon the throne.[10] Beng. writes that it belongs to the four beasts; Züll. and De Wette, to one of them. It may be referred also to the elders, because of the form of the summons (τ. θ. ἡμῶν).[11]

[1] Cf. iv. 8 sqq., v. 9 sqq., xi. 15 sqq., xv. 3, xvi. 5 sqq.

[2] Cf. iv. 6.

[3] Nor does it occur in the rest of the N. T.

[4] With reference to the victory of God over the earth, whose sign is four.

[5] Cf. xvi. 7.

[6] Cf. xviii. 23, where there are also two coordinated clauses with ὅτι.

[7] ἥτις, κ.τ.λ. Cf. xii. 13. On the subject, cf. xviii. 23 sq., also xi. 18, vi. 10.

[8] De Wette, who is right in rejecting the arbitrary assumption of Ewald, to connect ver. 3 to ver. 2.

[9] Cf. v. 8, 14, iv. 11.

[10] Against Ewald, Hengstenb.

[11] Cf. also v. 9.

— *τῷ θεῷ*. The dat. with *αἰνεῖν*, which is regarded as though it were *διδόναι αἶνον*,[1] occurs also in the LXX.[2] Comparison with the Hebrew text shows not only that the expression *αἰνεῖτε τῷ θεῷ* says precisely the same as the *ἀλληλούια* retained in the Hebrew form,[3] but also that the construction of *αἰνεῖν* with the dat. has occurred where the הַלַּל was combined with לְ. In Jer. xx. 13, a clause so construed at any rate precedes. — *πάντες οἱ δοῦλοι αὐτοῦ*. Cf. Ps. cxxxv. 1. — *οἱ φοβούμενοι, κ.τ.λ.* Cf. Ps. cxv. 13.

Vv. 6–8. The final chorus, which is likewise opened with hallelujah, passing by the judgment in which already the adorable glory of God has been occupied, points forward especially to the marriage of the Lamb, and, therefore, to the revelation of the glory of God, whereby — after all enemies have been judged — believers are to be beatified. Thus, therefore, the point carried to the full end appears in the pause in the Apocalyptic development marked by the ascriptions of praise (ver. 1 sqq.). — *ὡς φωνὴν, κ.τ.λ.* The explanation given at ver. 1 is here established by the fact that the comparison is satisfied not with the *ὄχλ. πολλ.*, but introduces still other things in the same sense.[4] — *λέγοντες*. The nom. stands still more out of construction than the acc. See Critical Notes, and cf. iv. 1, v. 13. — *ὅτι ἐβασίλευσεν*. The *ὅτι* specifying the reason as in ver. 2. On the conception *ἐβασίλ.*, cf. xi. 17. — *ὅτι ἦλθεν ὁ γάμος του ἀρνίου*. As the foundation of the present joy, this is likewise to be understood proleptically, like the *ἦλθεν*, xi. 18.[5] So, correctly, De Wette.[6] Vitr. is mistaken in his opinion of the state of affairs described, as he even states that the expression *ὁ γάμος τοῦ ἀρνίου* is synonymous with *τὸ δεῖπνον τοῦ γάμου τ. ἀρν.*, in order that both may in the same way[7] refer to the glorious state of the Church still to be expected within this temporal life. In the directly opposite interest, Züll. reaches the statement that *ὁ γάμος τοῦ ἀρνίου* is like *τὸ δεῖπν. τ. γάμ. τ. ἀρν.*, and that both expressions designate, not the future marriage itself,[8] but "the preliminary festival of the Messiah's marriage," i.e., the one thousand years' reign.[9] But the marriage of the Lamb with his bride, i.e., the entire assembly of believers,[10] is, in fact, nothing else than the distribution of the eternal reward of grace on the part of the coming Lord to his believers, who then enter with Him into the full glory of the heavenly life.[11] What the final promises of the epistles, chs. ii. and iii., proclaim under various figures with respect to individuals,[12] is represented as pertaining to the entire Church as the bride of the coming Lord, under the figure of the marriage of the Lamb, and, therefore, as the most intimate and eternally uninterrupted fellowship with Him who has redeemed the Church with his own blood.[13] An application to individuals follows also in ver. 9. The proleptical (*ἦλθεν, ἡτοίμασεν, ἐδόθη*)

[1] Luke xviii. 43.

[2] 1 Chron. xvi. 36, xxiii. 5; 2 Chron. xx. 19; Jer. xx. 13.

[3] Cf. Hesych., who very accurately explains ἀλληλ.: αἶνος τῷ ὄντι θεῷ, αἰνεῖτε τὸν κυριον ["Praise to him that is God, praise ye the Lord"].

[4] Cf. i. 15.

[5] Cf. xiv. 7.

[6] Cf. also Hengstenb.

[7] Cf. xxi. 9 sqq.

[8] xxi. 9 sqq.

[9] xx. 4 sqq.

[10] xxi. 9, xxii. 17. Cf. xii. 1; Isa. liv. 1 sqq.; Hos. ii. 19 sq.; Ezek. xvi. 7 sqq.; Eph. v. 25.

[11] Cf. xi. 18, xxii. 12.

[12] Cf. especially iii. 20.

[13] Cf. v. 6, 9, vii. 17, xiv. 1.

allusion to the blessed fulfilment of the mystery of God,[1] that has now not yet, in fact, occurred, is here the more suitable in the mouths of the heavenly beings, since, in fact, an act already of the final judgment — viz., the destruction of the great harlot — has been executed, and, consequently, the actual beginning of that fulfilment has been made. — *ἡ γυνὴ αὐτ.* The expression is entirely appropriate to the bride,[2] so that the alteration *ἡ νύμφη αὐτ.*[3] appears groundless. — *ἡτοίμασεν ἑαυτήν.* As becomes the bride who with joy awaits the coming of her bridegroom.[4] An important part of her is expressly emphasized in ver. 8, in conformity with the figure *καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῇ, κ.τ.λ.*, and then interpreted by John, *τὸ γὰρ βύσσινον, κ.τ.λ.* — On *ἐδόθη αὐτῇ ἵνα*, cf. vi. 4. — *βύσσ. λαμπρὸν καθαρόν.* Excellently, Grot.: "You see here the dignified garb, as that of a matron, not ostentatious, like that of the harlot previously described." That really distinct references are intended by *λαμπρόν* and *καθαρόν*,[5] is not to be inferred at all events from the interpretation that follows. Cf. also vii. 14. Meanwhile, it is in itself correct to distinguish the negative innocency of the life from the positive practice of virtue. — *τὰ δικαιώματα τῶν ἁγίων ἐστίν.* Cf. a similar interpretation, v. 8. The form of the expression,[6] and the real parallel,[7] suggest only *just deeds* in which the saints have maintained their fidelity. On the contrary, Ew. ii.: declaration of righteousness; also Meyer, on Rom. v. 16: the divine sentence of justification which the saints have received. But the plural form resists this mode of exposition, which, so far as the subject itself is concerned, refers to the writer of the Apocalypse a thought of so peculiarly a Pauline stamp as does not occur elsewhere in the Apoc. Of course, an allusion to the grace bestowed by God, as the ground and source of the *δικαιώματα* belonging to the saints, is contained in a delicate way in the *ἐδόθη αὐτῇ ἵνα, κ.τ.λ.*; but just this reference to the Divine giving prevents us, on the other hand, from defining the *δικαιώματα* as a *Divine* activity, but allows us to think only of the just deeds of *saints*.[8] In this result Gebhardt[9] and Klief. also harmonize. [See Note LXXXIV., p. 461.]

Vv. 9, 10. The significance of the short interlude lies in what the angel says to John (ver. 9), by applying in express exhortation,[10] the reference contained already in the ascription of praise of the heavenly beings, to the goal of all the hopes of believers, and emphatically confirming the consolatory certainty of the hope thus set before believers, by the assurance that this word of God is true. Also to the prophetical declaration of this glorious hope by John, an attestation is given in ver. 10, which must confirm believers[11] receiving the testimony of the prophet in the hope and patience upon which their victory depends. — *λέγει μοι.* The one speaking is, at all events, according to ver. 10, an angel; but not "an interpreting angel," such as Ewald and Ebrard think was the constant attendant of John,[12] but the

[1] Cf. x. 7.
[2] Gen. xxix. 20; Deut. xxii. 24; Matt. i. 20.
[3] ℵ. Cf. xxi. 9.
[4] Cf. xxii. 17, xxi. 2; Matt. xxv. 10: *αἱ ἕτοιμοι.*
[5] Hengstenb.: "The brilliant glory of a virtuous life, and spotless purity from sins."
[6] Cf. xv. 4.
[7] Cf. xiv. 4 sq.
[8] Cf. the *ἀδικήματα*, xviii. 5.
[9] p. 176.
[10] Cf. xiv. 13.
[11] Cf. i. 3, xxii. 18 sqq.
[12] Cf. i. 1.

angel who from xvii. 1 on serves John as the communicator of the revelation.[1] To this points also the immediately succeeding declaration of the same angel (*οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι, κ.τ.λ.*). — *Γράψον μακάριοι, κ.τ.λ.*). Cf. xiv. 13. — *τὸ δεῖπνον τοῦ γάμ. τ. ἀρν.* In a still more concrete way than ver. 7 (*ὁ γάμος τ. ἀρν.*) is the final blessed communion with the Lord illustrated. Moreover the paracletic pertinence of the discourse brings with it also the fact that it is not the idea of the Church as the bride of the Lamb, but that of individual believers as wedding guests, which enters here.[2] By the repetition of the formula *καὶ λέγει μοι*, the succeeding speech of the angel is especially separated from his preceding words, and thus receives a peculiar importance. If we suppose that the art. is to be read before *ἀληθινοὶ*,[3] — which certainly does not serve to facilitate the construction,[4] — we must translate with Beng., Ebrard, Bleek, and Ew. ii.: "These are the true words of God." The ingenious explanation of Hengstenb. ("These words are true, they are words of God"), even apart from the art. before *ἀληθ.*, is refuted by the fact that the *εἰσίν*, in any case, belongs not before, but after, the *τοῦ θεοῦ*. De Wette, who translates: "These words are the true (words) of God,"[5] appeals, in opposition to Beng., to the parallel, xxi. 5. But there the construction of the sentence is extremely simple, since to the subj. *οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι* the definition of the predicate is added, *πιστοὶ καὶ ἀληθινοί εἰσιν*; but here not only the *τοῦ θεοῦ*, but especially the art. before *ἀληθ.*, effects another relation in the entire statement. By means of this art., it becomes far simpler to bring together *οἱ λόγοι οἱ ἀληθινοὶ*, and to understand these words combined with *τοῦ θεοῦ* as a predicate to the subject *οὗτοι*.[6] But the sense is by no means that which Bengel's explanation suggests to De Wette,[7] but after the angel has afforded John the revelation of the judgment upon the harlot, and, from this beginning of the final judgment, has given an intimation concerning the blessed mystery of God, which lies back of the entire judgment, he reviews all the words of revelation, of which he had served as the interpreter to the prophet from xvii. 1 on. These, he says, are the true, i.e., the genuine and right, words of God. The *ἀληθινοί* here mentions not the truth or the correctness of the contents, but the reality of the correlated statement: *τοῦ θεοῦ*. This explanation is afforded, on the one hand, by the plural *οἱ λόγοι* alone, — which Hengstenb., as well as Klief., refers to 5–8, Ebrard to 6–8 and 9, but the most do not take into further consideration, — and, on the other hand, also by what is reported in ver. 10. Ebrard was on the right track when he alluded to the expression *οἱ λόγοι τοῦ θεοῦ*, xvii. 17; but he wanders from it again, when, just as he understands those *λόγοι τοῦ θεοῦ* as promises concerning the final redemption of the Church, so, in this passage, he limits the *λόγοι οἱ ἀληθ. τ. θ.* to vv. 6–8 and 9. The latter is not entirely correct; for there is no reason for excluding the songs of vv. 1–5, which also refer to the goal presented in ver. 9, in a manner precisely identical with vv. 6–8.

[1] Beng., Züll., De Wette, Hengstenb.

[2] Cf. iii. 20; Matt. xxii. 1 sqq., xxv. 1 sqq. Beng., Hengstenb.

[3] See Critical Notes.

[4] Against Hengstenb.

[5] Cf. Züll.: "These true words are God's words."

[6] Cf. xx. 5; Luke xxiv. 44.

[7] Now the truth of God's word manifests itself, viz., in its immediate results.

But what is said from ver. 1 on, concerning the now-impending glorification of the Church, has to do with but one side of the subject, with only one part of the λόγοι τοῦ θεοῦ (xvii. 17), or of the mystery of God, announced by the ancient prophets.[1] This one point is made prominent also in the songs from ver. 1 on, only upon the ground of the judgment lying before the same, which is now already fulfilled in an act. As now (xvii. 17) the λόγοι τ. θεοῦ contain both, viz., the proclamation of the Divine judgment against every thing antichristian, — the kings of the world, with the beast of the world, are to rule only until the words of God, which proclaim the destruction of these same powers, shall find their fulfilment, i.e., until the dominion of those antichristian powers shall be annihilated according to God's declaration, — and the promise; the λόγοι οἱ ἀληθ. τ. θ., in this passage, refer to all the revelations which the prophet has received, as the fulfilment of the promise (xvii. 1) of the angel even now also speaking with him (δείξω σοι τὸ κρίμα τῆς πόρνης τ. μεγ.), i.e., they refer to xviii. 1–xix. 9. By the expression οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι οἱ ἀληθ., a review is made of that entire section — in which the expressions referring to the glorification of believers, xix. 1–9, are represented in most immediate combination with judgment upon the antichristian powers already fulfilled in one act — in a way precisely analogous to that of xxii. 6, where, at the conclusion of the entire revelation, a confirmatory reference is made to all that was disclosed to the gazing prophet, from iv. 1 on, as about to happen. But in this passage, also, such a conclusion is entirely justified, because here an important part of what was to happen had already happened, viz., the judgment upon the great harlot; and therewith the fulfilment of the words,[2] or of the mystery,[3] of God, had already begun. Now also there is given to the prophet the direct pledge of the certainty of what he has beheld; that these words which he has received are the actual and true words of God himself. From this the explanation follows as to why it is that John (ver. 10)[4] falls down before the angel in order "to worship" him. Ebrard is wrong in his attempt to attach a prophetic significance to this occurrence; viz., that the children of God are to be warned against the temptation of worshipping angels, "who have brought about the victory over antichrist." The last is here entirely foreign. Grot., Vitr., Beng., etc., recognize in the adoring prostration an excessive token of gratitude, and therefore forbidden also by the angel.[5] De Wette, in accordance with his exposition of 9*b*, finds here an expression of joyful astonishment at prophecies so confirmed (?). But partly from what precedes (λόγ. οἱ ἀληθ. τοῦ θεοῦ), and partly from the manner in which the angel rejects the adoration as not due him, as a fellow-servant of John, it may be first of all inferred that John regarded the angel thus addressing him, not as a fellow-servant, but as the Lord himself.[6] At first,[7] John had a proper estimate of the angel; but just by what was said (ver. 9*b*), John could attain the supposition that the Lord himself spoke to him. — ὅρα μή. The aposiopesis[8] is

[1] x. 7.
[2] xvii. 17.
[3] x. 7.
[4] As also xxii. 8.
[5] Cf. also Hengstenb., who, however, praises the humility of John as well as of the angel.
[6] Cf. Laun.
[7] xvii. 1, xv. 6, xvi. 1 sqq.
[8] Cf. Winer, p. 558.

self-evident from what precedes: "See that thou dost it not!" Ay, do it not! — *σύνδουλος*. Because the angel serves the same Lord[1] as John and all his brethren, "who have the testimony of Jesus," i.e., all believers.[2] The Lord is God;[3] to him, therefore, belongs the adoration which John intended to offer to the angel (*τῷ θεῷ προσκύνησον*). The entire repulse by the angel does not therefore sound "as tender as possible, almost having the tone of intercession,"[4] but is throughout decided. — The closing words of ver. 10 belong not to the address of the angel, but are a remark of John, whereby he establishes and explains (*γάρ*) what has just been said by the angel. It is incorrect to explain the gen. *τοῦ Ἰησοῦ* as subjective, "the testimony proceeding from Jesus;"[5] for if, on the one hand, reference to the expression *ἐχόντων τὴν μαρτ. τοῦ Ἰησοῦ* require this explanation,[6] on the other hand the declaration is intelligible only by defining the *μαρτυρία τοῦ Ἰησ.* as *τὸ πνευμα τῆς προφητείας*. This cannot mean: "He who confesses Christ as thou dost has also the spirit of prophecy,"[7] but designates, in the sense of 1 Pet. i. 11, and in thorough agreement with what is indicated in i. 1 and xxii. 6, 16, concerning the nature and the origin of prophecy, that Christ, by himself imparting his testimony of revelation to a man, fills him[8] with the spirit of prophecy, — who now speaks from and through the prophets.[9] As Christ, the coming One, is the goal of all Christian prophecy,[10] so is He also its author. From the closing words of the verse, it might be inferred,[11] that "they who have the testimony of Jesus" are not believers in general, but only the prophets, so that the angel would call himself a fellow-servant only of the prophets; as Hengstenb. also (xxii. 6) understands by the *δούλοις αὐτοῦ* only prophets. But as (xxii. 6), on the contrary, the servants of God[12] are distinguished from the prophets, and considered as the believers for whose instruction the prophets receive their revelations,[13] so also in this passage.[14] Believers do not have the testimony proceeding from Jesus without the service of the prophets, as John himself is one; but they are prophets because of the testimony communicated to them by the Lord, which testimony in them is the spirit of prophecy. Thus there is in ver. 10*b* an attestation to the prophetical book of John, similar to that which was emphatically maintained in the beginning[15] and at the close.[16] [Note LXXXV., p. 461.]

Vv. 11-21. Christ himself, as the already triumphant victor, goes forth

[1] Cf. vi. 11.
[2] Cf. vi. 9.
[3] xxii. 6.
[4] Züll.
[5] Against Ewald: "If any one with constancy maintain faith in Christ;" De Wette; Hengstenb., Ebrard, not clear.
[6] Cf. vi. 9, xii. 17.
[7] De Wette, Ewald.
[8] Vitr. paraphrases: "The same Spirit who speaks and acts through those who proclaim the testimony of Christ (which the apostles did), is the very one who speaks through me, who am sent by the Lord to declare to thee the things of the time to come. Thy affairs, therefore, are as important as my dignity, and we are accordingly called, as fellow-servants, to offices of not unequal honor." But it would be impossible for the concluding words of ver. 10 to belong to the angel (cf. ver. 8, v. 8); and the explanation of *τ. ἐχόντων τὴν μαρτυρίαν τ. Ἰησ.*, which forms its basis, is false.
[9] Cf. ii. 7, 11, 17, iii. 22, with ii. 1, 8, 12, iii. 14.
[10] Also of that of O. T., x. 7.
[11] Hengstenb.; cf. Vitr.
[12] Cf. i. 1.
[13] Cf. xxii. 16.
[14] Cf., besides, xxii. 9.
[15] i. 1 sqq.
[16] xxii. 6 sqq.

with his heavenly hosts to destroy the secular powers still remaining; viz., that of the beast and false prophet (ver. 19 sq.), and the inhabitants of the earth rendering allegiance to the beast (ver. 21).

Vv. 11-16. The going forth of Christ and his followers from heaven to the judgment. — *τὸν οὐρανὸν ἠνεῳγμένον*, cf. iv. 1. The seer, at xvii. 3, in spirit was carried to the earth.[1] — *καὶ ἰδοὺ ἵππος λευκὸς*, cf. vi. 2. — *καλούμενος πιστὸς καὶ ἀληθινὸς*. The construction of the individual expressions is also entirely similar to that of vi. 2. The *καλούμενος* placed without *ἐστίν* in a kind of apposition to *ὁ καθήμ. ἐπ' αὐτον* effects a transition to the description in the finite tense (*καὶ ἐν δικ. κρίνει, κ.τ.λ.*). Concerning the idea of *πιστός* and of *ἀληθινός*, cf. iii. 7, 14. There is a significant prominence given to the circumstance that the one now going forth to most complete final victory is called not only "faithful," with respect to his promises to his believers now to be fulfilled by himself, but also "true;" for it is just by his present triumphal march against his enemies, that he proves himself to be the Messiah announced from olden time. Hence the entire description is filled with tones harmonizing with the O. T. prophecies; the Lord now manifests himself as the One who was truly meant in all those prophecies. — *καὶ ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ κρίνει*. Cf. Isa. xi. 3 sqq. The *καὶ πολεμεῖ* added in this passage expresses the meaning of the *κρίνει* in a way corresponding to the nature of the description here presented.[2] — *οἱ δὲ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτ., κ.τ.λ.* Cf. i. 14. — *διαδήματα πολλά*. If the many diadems upon his head are to be regarded trophies of victories already won,[3] the kings, possibly the ten kings of ch. xvii.,[4] must at all events be regarded as vanquished. But the judgment upon these is not yet fulfilled. It might also be said that the Lord, going forth as triumphant victor, who also (vi. 2) receives from the very beginning a victor's garland, appears here already adorned with the crowns of the kings to be judged by him. But the reference to ver. 16, where Christ is called the *βασιλεὺς βασιλέων*, is more probable.[5] The explanation of Andr., that the dominion of Christ over all who are in heaven and on earth is indicated, is too indefinite. — *ἐχων ὄνομα — αὐτός*. Either the name mentioned in ver. 13 is meant,[6] or although it was "written," — possibly on the Lord's forehead,[7] but not, indeed, upon his vesture,[8] or on the many diadems,[9] — and therefore was visible to John, the name remained, nevertheless, unknown to him, because it was inscrutable [10] To think of any definite name besides that designated (ver. 13), and to attempt to conjecture it, is an undertaking in violation of the context.[11] The second of the two possible views is the more probable; for even if the *ὃ οὐδεὶς εἶδεν, κ.τ.λ.*, be explained by the mystery lying in the name *ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ*,[12] yet the context makes the impression, particularly as the assertion *καὶ κέκληται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, κ.τ.λ.*, is separated from ver. 12 by a

[1] De Wette. Cf. xxii. 10.
[2] Ver. 14: *στρατεύματα*; ver. 19: *τ. πόλεμον*.
[3] Cf. 2 Sam. xii. 13; 1 Macc. xi. 13. Grot., Wetst., Beng.; cf. also Vitr.
[4] Züllig.
[5] Ewald, De Wette, Hengstenb., Bleek, Volkm., Luthardt.
[6] Calov., Vitr., etc.
[7] Ewald, Bleek, Hengstenb.
[8] Calov.
[9] Eichh.
[10] Grot., Beng., De Wette, Hengstenb., Ebrard.
[11] Against Ewald, Volkmar, etc., who understand the name יהוה.
[12] Vitr.

special item of the description (*κ. περιβ., κ.τ.λ.*), that a name is intended to be indicated, which is known only to the Lord himself, since He alone has and knows what is designated in the name.[1] But in accordance with iii. 12, it may be thought that the complete blessedness of believers in immediate communion with the Lord (ver. 9) will disclose also the mystery of this name.[2] — *καὶ περιβεβλημένος ἱμάτιον βεβαμμένον αἵματι.* After the manner of the victor, Isa. lxiii. 1 sqq.,[3] whose prophetic description finds its true fulfilment in the Lord.[4] — *καὶ κέκληται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ.* The form of the expression *κέκληται τ. ὄν. αὐτ.* shows that here[5] the definite name, familiar to believers, which the Lord has received as a significant proper name,[6] and continues to bear, is intended to be designated. The name corresponds to the position of the Lord as Mediator, as described i. 1 sqq.[7] Cf. also Introduction, p. 66. — *τὰ στρατεύματα, κ.τ.λ.* The armies of the Lord[8] are not only the hosts of angels who appear elsewhere as attendants of the Lord coming to judgment,[9] but departed believers are also to be regarded as referred to.[10] This is indicated not only by the comprehensive expression *τὰ στρατ. τὰ ἐν τῷ οὐρ.*, but also by the vesture (*βύσσ. λευκ. καθ.*; cf. ver. 8). — *ῥομφαία ὀξεῖα.* The sharp sword proceeding from the mouth of the Lord designates here, where, besides, it is attached to statements recalling ancient prophetical descriptions (*ἵνα ἐν αὐτ. πατάξῃ τὰ ἔθνη*),[11] still more clearly than i. 16, the Lord thus appearing as the true and real One who is to come (ver. 11). — *καὶ αὐτὸς ποιμανεῖ, κ.τ.λ.* Cf. also, on this definitive and, therefore, so full-toned description, which gives assurance[12] of the certainty of the threat by *τ. θεοῦ τ. παντοκρ.*, Isa. lxiii. 2 sq. with xiv. 10, 19. The expression *τὴν ληνὸν τοῦ οἴνου*, Hengstenb. explains, not, indeed, accurately, by saying that the wine-press is the wrath of God, and the wine flowing from it is the blood of enemies. The form of the idea in which the two figures of the wine-press[13] and the cup of wrath[14] are combined,[15] affirms, however, that from the wine-press trodden by the Lord, the wine of God's anger flows, with which his enemies are to be made drunk. — The name, which (ver. 16) is written on the vesture and on the thigh, *βασιλεὺς βασιλέων καὶ κύριος κυρίων*, gives — as is made prominent at the conclusion of this entire description, ver. 11 sqq. — the express pledge of that which is distinctly marked already in the entire appearance of the Lord; viz., that the Lord who now goes forth to the conflict with the kings of the earth, will show himself to be the King of all kings. — *καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν μηρὸν αὐτ.* The meaning cannot be that the name stood not only on the vesture, but also on the actual thigh, so that, after laying aside the bloody garment,

[1] Cf. ii. 17.

[2] The several names indicated in the at least uncertain reading (see Critical Notes) give no clear idea. Perhaps also the plural *διαδ. πολλ.* has had much to do with the origin of the reading.

[3] Beng., Züll., De Wette, Hengstenb., etc.

[4] Cf. ver. 11.

[5] Cf., on the other hand, ver. 12.

[6] Cf., on the other hand, the several appellative designations of vv. 11, 16.

[7] Cf. also xix. 10, iii. 14.

[8] Cf., on the other hand, ver. 19.

[9] Matt. xvi. 27, xxv. 31; 2 Thess. i. 7. De Wette, Hengstenb., Bleek, Luthardt.

[10] Cf. also Ew. ii. Incorrectly, Volkm.: The earthly.

[11] Cf. Isa. xi. 4. *κ. αὐτ. ποιμανεῖ, κ.τ.λ.* Cf. ii. 27, xii. 5.

[12] Cf. i. 8, xi. 17, xv. 3.

[13] xiv. 19.

[14] xiv. 10.

[15] De Wette

the name could appear in the same place.[1] But the explanation of Wetst., Eichh., De Wette, Bleek, etc., who allude to the fact that, e.g., sculptors are accustomed to fix the stamp of their name on the body of the statue in the region of the thighs, is opposed by the preceding *ἐπὶ τὸ ἱμάτιον*, in connection with which the *καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν μηρὸν αὐτ.* has the force, that the name, at all events, must be regarded as on the vesture, and that, too, where the thigh is. The name is, therefore, not to be sought upon an imaginary[2] sword-handle,[3] but we must regard it as being upon the girdle, although this, however, does not come into consideration as the sword-belt,[4] but as a girdle which holds the tucked-up vesture of one advancing to battle.[5] In violation of the context, Ew. ii.: "From the shoulders to the thighs."

Vv. 17, 18. An angel standing in the sun summons all fowls to eat the bodies of kings, and of all the inhabitants of the earth, who are to be slain by the Lord.[6] *ἕνα ἀγγ.* Cf. viii. 13, xviii. 21. — *ἐν τῷ ἡλιῷ*, "in the sun," because from this standpoint, and at the same time with the glory suitable to an angel, he can best call to the fowls flying *ἐν μεσουρανήματι*.[7] — *Δεῦτε συνάχθητε, κ.τ.λ.* Cf. Ezek. xxxix. 17 sqq. The punishment is, as it corresponds to the idea of the final judgment, one that is absolutely relentless; since on the slaying, the consumption of the corpses by all the fowls under the heaven follows. — *σάρκας βασιλέων, κ.τ.λ.* The exhaustive specification[8] expressly declares, what is self-evident also from the connection, that the slain *λοιποί* (ver. 21) are the entire mass of inhabitants of the earth.[9]

Vv. 19–21. The Lord's judgment and war are accomplished. This act of judgment John beholds, as it proceeds not only from the *καὶ εἶδον* (ver. 19), but also from the mode of representation itself (*ἐπιάσθη*, ver. 20; *ἐχορτάσθησαν*, ver. 21). Cf., on the other hand, ch. xviii. — *τὸ θηρίον καὶ τοὺς βασιλεῖς, κ.τ.λ.* With the beast, representing the secular power,[10] his confederates appear, the kings of the earth,[11] and their armies, consisting of the entire number of the dwellers on earth,[12] who now carry into effect the conflict proclaimed already in xvi. 14;[13] its result, however, is described in ver. 20 sq., in such a way as to correspond to the significant name of xvi. 16. For the conflict which is to be described is not one that is painful, or as to its issue possibly doubtful, but the result of an unconditional victory over enemies, won by the justice and omnipotence of the Lord. — *κ. μετὰ τοῦ στρατεύματος αὐτοῦ.* The sing. is chosen here,[14] in order to mark the holy unity of the entire army of Christ, in contrast with the rent body of his enemies.[15] *καὶ ὁ μετ' αὐτοῦ ψευδοπροφήτης.* The position of the false prophet as the auxiliary of the beast is designated in harmony with the description (xiii. 11 sqq.). The allusion

[1] Against Beng.
[2] And that, too, against ver. 15.
[3] Grot.
[4] Against Vitr., also against Hengstenb., who, on account of ver. 15, explains that the name appears here in the place of the engirded sword; cf. Ps. xlv. 4 sq.
[5] Züll., Volkm.
[6] Cf. ver. 21.
[7] Ew. i., De Wette, Hengstenb., Ebrard, Volkm. Incorrectly, Ew. ii., p. 334: "*by* the sun."
[8] Cf. vi. 15.
[9] Cf. xiii. 4, 8, 14, 16.
[10] xiii. 1 sqq.
[11] xvi. 12 sqq., xvii. 12 sqq.
[12] xiii. 4, 8, 16.
[13] Notice the art. *τὸν πόλεμ.*; also the *συνηγμένα* here repeated.
[14] Cf., on the other hand, ver. 14.
[15] Beng., Hengstenb.

also to the peculiar function of the false prophet (*ὁ ποιήσας, κ.τ.λ.*) points back to xiii. 13 sqq. — The manner in which the judgment is fulfilled is in conformity with the nature of the enemies:[1] the beast, together with the false prophet, "was taken, and both were cast alive into the lake of fire burning with brimstone." Who does this, is not said; but the act dare not be referred to Christ, for the reason that he does not execute his various acts of judgment by his own hand.[2] It is evident that the victorious result of the war of judgment[3] is determined by Christ's power; but according to the analogy of xii. 7 sqq., we must regard the *στρατεύματα* of the Lord, as the executors of the judgment.[4] — *ζῶντες.* For only human enemies could suffer bodily death (ver. 21) before the eternally condemning judgment of the world.[5] — *τὴν λίμνην, κ.τ.λ.* Cf. xx. 10, 14 sq., xxi. 8. — *οἱ λοιποὶ.* See on ver. 17 sq. — *ἀπεκτάνθησαν ἐν τῇ ρομφαίᾳ, κ.τ.λ.* To seize the enemies, and thus to cast them into hell (ver. 20), is not befitting the Lord himself; but it is something else, when the sword which proceeds from his mouth slays the enemies. This gives the idea of the victory entirely without laborious effort, and presupposing no proper conflict of Him who, according to the prediction of the ancient prophets, destroys his enemies with the breath of his lips.[6] — *κ. πάντα τὰ ὄρνεα, κ.τ.λ.* Cf. ver. 17 sq.

The allegorical exposition, when applied with consistency to ch. xix., must be regarded untenable in the degree that it arrays itself against the context. The fowls (ver. 17 sq., 21) are, according to Hammond, the Goths and Vandals, who desolated the Roman Empire; according to Coccejus, the Turks, who, after the capture of Constantinople, afflicted the Catholic West; according to Hengstenb., the Huns, who prepared grievous calamities for the Germanic nations, the destroyers of the Roman Empire. Wetst. found the prophecy fulfilled in the assassination of Domitian, the last of the Flavians,[7] and in the conquest of his soldiers (ver. 21). Grot. understands by the *βασιλεῖς* (ver. 19), "Julian with his nobles," and remarks on ver. 20: "Theodosius the Great abolished the public sacrifices of the heathen," and on ver. 21: "By the decree of Christ, who used Justinian for this purpose, to punish idolaters with death." Others, as C. a Lap., have thought that the fulfiment of the prophecy could be shown by the horrible death and burial of many heretics. So C. a Lap. cites authors who report of Luther that he committed suicide, and that at his burial not only a multitude of ravens, but also the Devil, who had come from Holland, appeared. — Luther, gloss on ver. 11: "The word of God is opposed to the defenders of the Pope, and none of their defence is of any avail."

[1] Cf. Beng., De Wette, Hengstenb.
[2] Cf. xx. 2.
[3] Cf. ver. 11.
[4] Cf. xx. 9 sqq., xiv. sq.
[5] xx. 14 sqq.
[6] Cf. Isa. xi. 4.
[7] v. 20.

Notes by the American Editor.

LXXXIV. Ver. 8. *τὰ δικαιώματα τῶν ἁγίων.*

Some of the older Protestant interpreters explain the plural *δικαιώματα*, as determined by the fact that it comprises the two righteousnesses of the believer, the imputed righteousness of Christ and his own inherent righteousness. So Forbes in *Poole's Synopsis*. Calov. also, upon the ground that the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the believer will never cease. Others, like Cluverus, maintain that each saint has a *δικαίωμα*; and, therefore, there are *δικαιώματα*, because there are many saints. So Alford: "The plural is probably distributive, implying not many *δικαιώματα* to each one, as if they were merely good deeds, but one *δικαίωμα* to each of the saints, enveloping him as in a pure white robe of righteousness." John Gerhard (*L. C.*, viii. 167) also adopts the distributive use of the plural, although referring it to imputed righteousness. Philippi (*Kirch. Glaubenslehre*, v. 1, 252), however, concurs with Düsterdieck: "The right deeds of the saints are the robe of fine linen, to be clothed in which is granted them (xix. 8)."

LXXXV. Ver. 10. *ἡ γὰρ μαρτυρία Ἰησοῦ.*

Luthardt paraphrases this clause: "He who has this testimony of Jesus participates also in the Spirit who works prophecy, and teaches how it is to be understood, because all prophecy has Jesus Christ as its contents; and, therefore, the knowledge and confession of Jesus Christ is the key of the future." Cremer accordingly infers that *ἐχειν τὴν μαρτ. Ἰησοῦ* (xii. 17, xix. 10, vi. 9) is synonymous with *ἐχειν τὸ πν. τῆς προφ.* Gebhard also insists on the subjective meaning of *Ἰησοῦ* here, and says that wherever "the testimony of Jesus" occurs, it is synonymous with "the word of God." Alford, dissenting from Düsterdieck's construction of *Ἰησοῦ* as subjective, says: "What the angel says is this: 'Thou, and I, and our brethren are all *ἐχοντες τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ*; and the way in which we bear this witness, the substance and essence of this testimony, is the spirit of prophecy; *ἐν πνεύμα ἐποτίσθημεν*. This spirit, given to me in that I show thee these things, given to thee in that thou seest and art to write them, is the token that we are fellow-servants and brethren.'"

CHAPTER XX.

Ver. 2. *ὁ ὄφις ὁ ἀρχαῖος.* So A, Lach., Tisch. The accus. (B, ℵ, Elz.) appears to be a modification. — According to A, B, min., the art., which is wanting in the Rec. before *διάβ.*, and before *σατ.*, but occurs in ℵ in both these places (so Tisch. IX.), belongs only in the latter place (Lach., Tisch.). — Ver. 3. The *αὐτὸν* after *ἐκλεισεν* (Elz.) is spurious (A, B, ℵ, al., Verss., Beng., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]). The present *πλανᾷ* (Griesb., Tisch.) is not sufficiently attested by B, and, besides, appears suspicious as an interpretation. Lach., also Tisch. IX. [and W. and H.] have properly maintained the Rec. *πλανήσῃ* according to A (ℵ: *πλανήσει*). — Ver. 4. The art. *τὰ* before *χίλ. ἔτη* (Elz.) is properly (A, ℵ, min.) deleted already by Beng. — Ver. 8. *τὸν πόλ.* So A, B, ℵ, 7, 8, 9, al., Lach., Tisch.; cf. xix. 19. — Ver. 9. *ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ*, which occurs also in ℵ$_1$, al., before *ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ* (Elz.), but in other witnesses stands last (Beng.), while still others transpose the positions of the prepositions *ἀπὸ* and *ἐκ*, belongs probably (cf. xxi. 2) in no way to the text (A, 12, al., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]). — Ver. 14. Read *οὗτος ὁ θάν. ὁ δεύτερός ἐστιν, ἡ λίμνη τοῦ πυρός* (A, B, al., Verss., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]). The last words are lacking in the Rec. ℵ modifies: *οὗτ. ὁ δεύτ. θάν. ἐστ., ἡ λ., κ.τ.λ.*

Already has judgment been executed upon the harlot,[1] upon the beast and his accomplice the false prophet,[2] and upon the dwellers on earth who worshipped the beast; now follows the judgment upon the proper first enemy, Satan himself, who[3] has used all those antichristian powers only as his instruments. The judgment upon Satan, decreed from all eternity, is executed in ver. 10. But *previous to* this, there is the binding of Satan for one thousand years (vv. 1–3), during which time they who are to partake of the first resurrection are to reign with Christ (vv. 4–6), and an attack upon the camp of the saints on the part of Gog and Magog, excited by Satan, who is let loose again for a short time, which is terminated by fire falling from heaven and consuming those nations (vv. 7–9); but, on the other hand, there is, *after* the final casting of Satan into the lake of fire, the proper judgment of the world (ver. 11 sqq.) at which *all men* appear, and they who are not written in the book of life are cast into the same lake of fire as that wherein are the beast and the false prophet already since xix. 20, into which Satan also has been eternally cast (ver. 10) before the final judgment of the world, and wherein now also at that final judgment death and hell are cast (ver. 14). — It is, therefore, to be noted: (1) with respect to the succession of the individual judgments, that this is the reverse of the succession in which the antichristian forms are presented; for the description of the latter begins (ch. xii.) with the original enemy, then proceeds to the beast and his accom-

[1] Cf. chs. xvii.–xix. [2] xix. 20. [3] Cf. on ch. xii.

plice, viz., the second beast or the false prophet (ch. xiii.),[1] and finally shows the woman carried by the beast, i.e., the definite city of the world (ch. xvii.), ay, the individual sovereigns in whom the beast is embodied (xvii. 11); while, on the contrary, the judgment descends first upon the city (xviii. 1, xix. 10), then upon the beast, together with the false prophet, and the mass of dwellers on earth worshipping the beast (xix. 11–21), and, finally, upon Satan (xx. 10, cf. xx. 4 sqq.). (2) Nor is the kind of judgment without natural distinctions: the city perishes in a terrible conflagration, and the beast and false prophet, as well as Satan, are cast alive into the lake of fire of hell; while the dwellers on earth, after having suffered bodily death (xix. 21, cf. xx. 9), are again awakened at the final judgment (xx. 11 sqq.), and not until then cast into the lake of fire for eternal torment.

Vv. 1–3. An angel, descending from heaven, binds Satan with a great chain, and casts him into the abyss for one thousand years. — *ἄγγελον.* The comparison of i. 18 cannot prove that the angel[2] is Christ.[3] — *τὴν κλεῖν τῆς ἀβύσσου.* The key of the abyss — which, according to the analogy of the in other respects not entirely conformable presentation, i. 18, is to be regarded as being in the hands of Christ — was "given," ix. 1, under particular circumstances, for a definite purpose to another; in this passage the angel, who likewise needed the key for a definite purpose (ver. 2 sq.), brought it from heaven, where he, therefore, had received it when he was sent. Ew. ii. is accordingly incorrect in identifying the angel in this passage with the one who is represented as being active in ix. 1–11. *ἅλυσιν.* Cf. Mark v. 3 sq.[4] — *ἐπὶ τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ.* Cf. v. 1. "*In*" the hand,[5] the chain could not be held because of its great weight; it lies "on" the hand, and hangs down on both sides. — *ἐκράτησεν.* Vivid representation of the event. Cf. xix. 20. — *ὁ ὄφις, κ.τ.λ.* The nominative of apposition, without construction, is like i. 5. On the designation, cf. xii. 9; the complete harmony in this passage shows that now that original enemy was bound, who, after he had been cast from heaven to earth, became the proper originator of every thing antichristian in the world. [See Note LXXXVI., p. 472.] *χίλια ἔτη.* The accus.[6] designates the length of the time during which Satan is to be bound. Cf. in other respects on ver. 10. — *εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον.* Cf. ver. 1, ix. 1, xi. 7, xvii. 8. The abyss of hell is the place where Satan properly belongs, and whence he himself, like the demoniacal powers, has proceeded in order to work upon earth. But since for a thousand years he will be confined against his will to one place,[7] so long is his agency on earth interrupted (*ἵνα μὴ πλαν., κ.τ.λ.*). — *καὶ ἐκλεισεν καὶ ἐσφράγισεν ἐπάνω αὐτοῦ.* With *ἐκλεισεν* the object *τὴν ἄβυσσον* is understood; but just because this is not expressly added, the limitation *ἐπάνω αὐτοῦ* can the more readily qualify the *ἐσφράγισεν*: "upon him," i.e., Satan, who has been cast into the bottomless pit, the angel

[1] Where also the relation of the dwellers on earth to the beast is shown.

[2] Beng., De Wette, etc.

[3] Against Hengstenb., Alcas., Calov., Vitr. Cf. also Coccej., who again understands the Holy Ghost.

[4] Etym., M.: ἅλυσις, ἡ ἐκ χαλκοῦ ἢ σιδήρου ἢ ἀργυρίου ἢ χρυσοῦ πεπληγμένη σειρά [ἅλυσις is a chain forged either from brass, or iron, or silver, or gold].

[5] Ew. ii. ℵ reads even ἐν τ. χ.

[6] Cf. ix. 5. [7] Cf. ver. 7: φυλακή.

"set a seal," in order to give the greater assurance of the secure guarding of the one imprisoned.[1] — ἵνα μὴ πλανήσῃ ἔτι τὰ ἔθνη. As he had previously done,[2] as long as unbound, he could exercise his wrath on earth.[3] The subj. aor., with a future meaning,[4] presupposes that during the one thousand years, and, therefore, after the act of judgment, xix. 21, there would still be nations who also, at the end of the one thousand years, would be actually led astray.[5] This seeming difficulty would be avoided by the reading πλανᾷ, which depends upon the view customary in the Church fathers, but absolutely in violation of the context, that the worldly period of one thousand years began with the birth or death of Christ, and, therefore, is the present.[6] — μετὰ ταῦτα; viz., τὰ χίλια ἔτη. The definite numerical specification immediately precedes, and to it corresponds also the temporal statement: μικρὸν χρόνον. — δεῖ. Cf. i. 1, iv. 1.

Vv. 4–6. The one thousand years reign which begins with the first resurrection. The allusion to the glory to be expected in the same, which is at the same time the pledge of participation in the blessedness of the eternity to be opened with the second resurrection, is made not without an express emphasis of the paracletic point which lies in this goal of Christian hope.[7] — καὶ εἶδον θρόνους. The prototype of Dan. vii. 9, 22, and the κρίμα, expressly mentioned in this passage, show that the θρόνοι come into consideration not as thrones of kings,[8] but only as seats of judges.[9] The interchange of the definite idea of a judicial session with that of further dominion — possibly also manifested in judging — coheres with the decided misunderstandings that the πεπελεκισμένοι and οἵτινες οὐ προσεκύνησαν are to be regarded as the subjects of ἐκάθισαν ἐπ' αὐτους, that the βασιλεῦσαι μετὰ τοῦ χριστοῦ ascribed to these must be esteemed synonymous with the assumed sitting of the same on thrones, and thus belongs to a conception of the whole, vv. 4–6, that is in violation of the context. Thus, especially, Augustine and his successors.[10] Who they are that sit upon thrones, and to whom judgment is given, is not said, and hence scarcely any thing except a negative determination is possible. According to what follows, they are not the martyrs and the other faithful believers who rather, by the judgment, become partakers of the one thousand years reign.[11] The ἐδόθη αὐτοις forbids us to refer it to God himself and Christ.[12] Ew. i. refers it to the apostles,[13] but at the same time to martyrs and Christians in other respects distinguished; and Beng. to the ἅγιοι, Dan. vii. 22. The most plausible explanation, if the idea is at all to be made more definite than is presented in the text, is to refer it to the twenty-four elders;[14] for it is especially appropriate to ascribe the reward of victors to these representatives of the Church, who offer the prayers of the saints to God,[15] and repeatedly testify to their blessed hope.[16] [See Note

[1] Cf. Matt. xxvii. 66.
[2] Cf. xiii. 14, xvi. 13. [3] xii. 12.
[4] Cf. Winer, p. 472.
[5] Cf. ver. 8 sq. [6] See on ver. 10.
[7] Ver. 6. Cf. xiv. 13, xvi. 15.
[8] Eichh., Züll.
[9] Heinr., Ewald, De Wette, Hengstenb., Ebrard, Bleek, Volkm. [10] See on ver. 10.
[11] Against Augustine, Züll., etc.
[12] Against Grot., who, however, comprises the angels.
[13] Cf. Matt. xix. 28.
[14] De Wette, Ew. ii.; cf. Hengstenb., who, besides the twelve apostles, understands the twelve patriarchs.
[15] v. 8. [16] v. 9, vii. 13 sqq., xi. 16 sqq.

LXXXVII., p. 473.] *καὶ τὰς ψυχὰς — ἐπὶ τὴν χεῖρα αὐτῶν.* They, to whom the *κρίμα* refers, are represented in two classes: the martyrs, viz., not only those whose souls already cry for vengeance, vi. 9, but also those additional ones[1] who have been slain throughout the whole earth by the beast, and with whose blood the harlot was drunken;[2] and all other believers who, notwithstanding the persecution and threatening death, have not rendered homage to the beast.[3] The last class of believers also (*οἵτινες οὐ προσεκύν, κ.τ.λ.*) is to be regarded, at the point of time fixed in ver. 4, as *dead;*[4] partly because of the explicit *ἔζησαν*;[5] partly because of the contrast *οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ τῶν νεκρῶν*, and the expression *οὐκ ἔζησαν*, applied to this death, from which a clear light falls upon the first *ἔζησαν*; partly also because of the definite and in no way allegorical designation *ἡ ἀνάστασις ἡ πρώτη.* The meaning of the text which is expressed regularly in all these points is, therefore, manifestly this, that while "the rest of the dead" are not revived until the second resurrection (ver. 12 sqq.), in the first resurrection only the two classes of dead believers take part, viz., in order to reign with Christ during the one thousand years. It is just by the *κρίμα* (ver. 4*a*) that this first especial reward of victors is promised them.[6] [See Note LXXXVIII., p. 473.] But the description of this glory, of this first part of the blessed mystery of God, which is fulfilled now for believers[7] after the judgment already executed upon their enemies, John cannot give without repeating with especial emphasis the consolation (ver. 6) which was united previously already,[8] with the references to the future reward of fidelity: *μακάριος καὶ ἅγιος, κ.τ.λ.* The item of holiness here especially emphasized has a reference to the priestly dignity (*κ. ἔσονται ἱερεῖς, κ.τ.λ.*) of those who participate in the one thousand years reign;[9] then the priestly, as well as the royal, character of believers comes forth in complete glory.[10] — *μέρος ἐν.* xxi. 8. Cf. John xiii. 8 (*μετά*). — *ὁ δεύτερος θάνατος.* Cf. ver. 14, xxi. 8. They who — after they have suffered bodily death, viz., the first — are revived at the first resurrection, intended only for believers, are thereby withdrawn from the power of the second death; for them the judgment of the world impending at the end of the one thousand years (ver. 11 sqq.) brings only the eternally valid confirmation of the priestly and kingly glory which, during the former period, had formed for believers the beginning of the blessedness to be bestowed upon them eternally.

Vv. 7-10. After the completion of the one thousand years, Satan is let loose; then he leads the heathen nations, Gog and Magog, to an attack upon the saints. But fire from heaven consumes those nations, and Satan is cast eternally into the lake of fire. — *λυθήσεται.* Here and in ver. 8 (*ἐξελεύσεται*) the statement has the express form of prophecy, which also is repeated in ver. 10*b* (*βασανισθήσονται*); in ver. 9 and ver. 10*a*, however, the prophet speaks so as to report the revelation imparted to him concerning the events impending at the end.[11] — *τὰ ἔθνη.* The difficulty that here the heathen

[1] vi. 11.
[2] xiii. 7, 10, 15, xvi. 5 sq., xvii. 6, xviii. 24.
[3] Cf., especially, xiii. 15 sqq.
[4] Ewald, De Wette, Ebrard; against Hengstenb., etc.
[5] Cf. ii. 8.
[6] Cf. ii. 11.
[7] Cf. x. 7.
[8] Cf. xix. 9, xiv. 13.
[9] Beng., etc.
[10] Cf. i. 6, v. 10.
[11] Cf. xix. 9 sq., 17 sq.

nations once again enter into conflicts against the saints, after, xix. 21, *all* nations and kings (rendering allegiance to the beast) have been annihilated, — to which also the other difficulty is added, that enemies to be found in the earthly life contend against believers who are partakers in the first resurrection,[1] — is not explained fully by emphasizing [2] the fact that these *ἔθνη*, Gog and Magog, dwell at the extreme ends of the earth. Vitr., Ewald, De Wette, etc., are indeed right when in harmony with the prototype, Ezek. xxxviii. 39,[3] and the idea of ver. 9 (*ἀνέβησαν ἐπὶ τὸ πλάτος τῆς γῆς*), they regard the farthest ends of the earth as the abode of these nations;[4] but in the entire description of ch. xiii. it was presupposed that all unbelieving inhabitants of the earth without exception, all kings and nations, had served the beast, and with him had perished. It is also to be acknowledged that the introduction of *ἔθνη* in this passage is a similar inconsistency as was previously shown in that the winds prepared at vii. 1 for destruction do not afterwards come into activity; but this inconsistency — which is in general a material, and that, too, an inexplicable difficulty, only when the entire description, vv. 1–10, is regarded in all its individual parts as a prophecy to be thus actually fulfilled, instead of distinguishing the ideal character of the Apocalyptic mode of representation, and the actual contents of the prophecy to be determined from the analogy of the Holy Scriptures — is modified by the fact that the nations here presented, Gog and Magog, stand in no relation whatever to the beast, and dwell at such a distance that also, in this respect, they may appear with the dwellers on earth formerly found in the empire of the beast. For it is also in harmony with this, that these heathen nations are led to the conflict against the saints immediately by Satan himself.[5] — *τὸν Γὼγ καὶ τὸν Μαγώγ*. Even in Jewish theology these two names occur, of which the first in Ezekiel, l. c., designates the king of the land and people of Magog[6] as names of nations belonging together.[7] Already, in Ezek., Magog appears, whose ethnographical determination,[8] of course, nevertheless, lies in the background of the description[9] as the representative and leader of the heathen nations in general, who rage against the

[1] See on ver. 10. [2] Vitr.

[3] Cf. especially xxxviii. 15. *ἀπ' ἐσχάτου βορρᾶ*.

[4] Against Hengstenb.: "The corners comprise whatever lies within the corners," so that the four corners of the earth designate, in fact, the same as *τὸ πλάτος τῆς γῆς*.

[5] Cf., on the other hand, xvi. 13 sq.

[6] Gen. x. 2. Cf. Winer, *Realwb.*, on this word.

[7] "At the end of the extremity of the days shall Gog and Magog, and their army, come up against Jerusalem; but by the hand of King Messiah shall they fall, and seven years of days shall the children of Israel kindle their fire with their weapons of war" (*Targ. of Jerusalem* on Num. xi. 27). Avoda Sara I.: "When Gog and Magog shall see war, the Messiah will say to them, Why hast thou come hither? They will reply, Against the Lord and his Christ." Cf. Wetst.

[8] Cf. Joseph., *Ant. Jud.*, I. 6: *Μαγώγης δὲ τοὺς ἀπ' αὐτοῦ Μαγώγας ὀνομασθέντας ᾤκισε, Σκύθας δὲ ὑπ' αὐτῶν* (sc. *Ἑλλήνων*) *προσαγορευομένους* [Magog colonized those named from him *Μαγώγαι*, but called by them (sc. the Greeks) Scythians]. M. Uhlemann (*Zeitschr. für Wissenschaftl. Theol. herausg. von Hilgenfeld*, 1862, p. 265 ff.) has in an exceedingly instructive way shown that Magog originally meant nothing but "dwelling-place, the land of Gog." But the name of the people, Gog, means "mountain." All etymological and geographical marks show that we are to recognize the actual people of Gog in the inhabitants of the Caucasus, as also the Greek *Καυκάσιον οὖρος* in Herodotus really says nothing else than "the Asiatic Kauk (Gog), or the Asiatic high mountain" (p. 283).

[9] Cf. xxxviii. 15.

people of God ruled by the Messiah, and are then destroyed by God. This prediction of Ezekiel was made use of already at xix. 17 sqq.;[1] but only in this passage is it expressly interwoven in the description of the final catastrophe. Therefore the art. of the τὸν πόλεμον refers to the final attack to be made on the part of those heathen nations, as a conflict which is confessedly to be expected.[2] [See Note LXXXIX., p. 473.] ἀνέβησαν εἰς τὸ πλάτος τῆς γῆς. From the ends of the earth (ver. 8) those nations come up to the broad plain of the earth,[3] in order thus to reach the city in which the saints are encamped. The ἀναβαίνειν, which is a common expression for military expeditions,[4] because the position of the attacked is naturally regarded as one that is to be found at an elevation,[5] is here the more appropriate, because the going up of the nations is properly regarded against Jerusalem.[6] — καὶ ἐκύκλευσαν τὴν παρεμβολὴν τῶν ἁγίων καὶ τὴν πόλιν τὴν ἠγαπημένην. The expression first of all distinguishes between the camp of the saints and the beloved city, i.e., Jerusalem, of course not in the sense wherein, e.g., Grot. understands by the camp, the seven churches, chs. i.–iii., and by the beloved city, Constantinople; but the saints are to be regarded as gathered in the camp, in order to defend the holy city against the attacks of the heathen.[7] The camp possibly surrounds the city, so that enemies at the same time enclose both.[8] That the beloved city is the earthly Jerusalem, — not the new Jerusalem[9] coming from heaven only at xxi. 1 sqq., after the judgment of the world (ver. 15), — is acknowledged with substantial unanimity; but it is an ordinary eluding of the context when Jerusalem is regarded as having the force only of a symbolical designation of the Church.[10] — καὶ κατέβη πῦρ, κ.τ.λ. Already, even in Ezekiel (xxxix. 6), this means of destruction alone is mentioned,[11] because it is represented in the most terrible manner as an immediate instrument of the Divine judgment of wrath.[12] — ὁ πλανῶν αὐτούς. Here, where, with the final judgment upon the Devil, there is an allusion to his peculiar guilt, the pres.[13] marks in a general way his seductive influence. — βασανισθήσονται, κ.τ.λ. *Eternal* torture; cf. xiv. 11.

With respect to what is said vv. 1–10, we must distinguish between the unprejudiced establishment of the exegetical results, and the theological judgment of what is found based upon the analogy of Scripture; and only from the former can we arrive at the latter. The exegetical comprehension of vv. 1–10, as a whole and in its details, has its most essential condition in the recognition of the fact that what is here described lies immediately *before* the proper judgment of the world (ver. 11 sqq.) and *after* those judicial acts of the entire final catastrophe which are described in xix. 19–

[1] Cf. xvi. 13 sqq.

[2] Cf. xvi. 14: τὸν πολ. τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείν., κ.τ.λ.

[3] Cf. Hab. i. 6.

[4] 1 Kings xxii. 4; Judg. i. 1.

[5] Hengstenb.

[6] Cf. Luke xviii. 31.

[7] De Wette.

[8] ἐκυκλ. Cf. Luke xix. 43.

[9] Cf. Andr., who, indeed, if the text is correct, says expressly τὴν νέαν Ιερουσ., but in his other remarks presupposes the earthly Jerusalem.

[10] Augustine, Beda, Andr., Vitr., Hengstenb. Likewise Klief.: "The essential meaning is "that finally also the peripheral nations shall in a mass arise somewhere against the Lord and his people, and that thereby, at some place, the Divine judgment of destruction shall occur" (p. 280).

[11] Cf., on the other hand, xxxviii. 22.

[12] Cf. Gen. xix. 24; Lev. x. 2; Num. xvi. 35; Luke ix. 54.

[13] Cf. xiv. 13.

21; i.e., in other words, every exposition must utterly fail which in vv. 1–10 maintains a *recapitulatio*,[1] which can occur only if the interpretation here be also allegorical. This false mode of exposition is expressly applied by Augustine,[2] and that, too, from polemical interests against the Chiliasts.[3] But the exegetical principle determining it is followed also by all those who[4] have found in vv. 1–10 predictions whose fulfilment could be recognized in certain historical events and states of the Church or the world, i.e., such as still occur within the present development of time. That mode of exposition must be comprehended as allegorizing, which necessarily is most arbitrary in points of the text that most clearly demand another mode of explanation. Augustine, e.g., in order to be able to recognize the one thousand years reign in the present state of the Church,[5] must find its beginning, viz., the binding of Satan, in the earthly life of Christ, and interpret the ἔβαλεν αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον: "The innumerable multitude of the godless is signified, whose hearts are very deep in malignity towards the Church of God." The resurrection, ver. 5, he interprets in the sense of Col. iii. 1; and on ver. 4 remarks: "It must not be thought that he speaks concerning the final judgment, but the thrones of rulers and the rulers themselves, by whom the Church is now governed, are to be understood." He accordingly explains ver 8 sq., since Gog means "roof," and Magog "from a roof:" "They are, therefore, nations in which we understand the Devil enclosed, as it were, from above, and he himself proceeding in some way from them, as they are the roof and he, from the roof." As to the declaration also: "They went up on the breadth of the earth," they are indicated not at all as having come, or about to come, to one place, as though the camp of the saints and the beloved city were in one place, although this is nothing but the Church of Christ spread abroad throughout the whole world. Similar misconceptions occur in Victorin.,[6] Beda,[7] Luther,[8] Hammond, Grot., etc.,[9] Wetst.,[10] Hengstenb.,[11] and others.

[1] Introduction, p. 13 sq.

[2] *De Civ. D.*, XX. c. 9, 2: "Afterwards by *recapitulating* what the Church is doing in those thousand years." Cf. Beda: "Recapitulating from the origin, he explains more fully as he said above: The beast," etc. Cf. xvii. 8.

[3] *Id.*, XX. c. 7, 1: "They call them χιλιαστάς from a Greek word, whom we, by a literal rendering, may call millenarians. It is tedious, however, to give a refutation in details, but we ought rather to show how this scripture is to be received."

[4] As especially also Hengstenb.

[5] l. c., c. 7, 2: "The thousand years, moreover, may be understood in two ways, either because in those last years, this is done: i.e., in the sixth millennium of years, as on the sixth day, whose later spaces are now passing, and finally on the sabbath that shall follow, which has no evening, viz., during the repose of the saints which has no end; or he certainly represented the one thousand years as all the years of this age."

[6] Who, regarding the number 1000 as composed of 10 which is to be interpreted as indicating the Decalogue, and 100 as intended for "the crown of virginity," explains: "He who has maintained with integrity his purpose of virginity, and has faithfully fulfilled the commandments of the Decalogue, is a true priest of Christ, and, perfecting with integrity the millenarian number, is believed to reign with Christ, and for him the Devil is bound aright."

[7] Who, e.g., refers the first resurrection, to baptism.

[8] Who reckons from the time of John to the Turks.

[9] Who put the binding of Satan in the time of Constantine, and by Gog and Magog understand, like Luther, the Turks.

[10] Who understands the thousand years as "the times of the Messiah," whose duration also is specified as forty years, occurring in the forty years from the death of Domitian, and, by Gog and Magog, understands Barcocheba.

[11] Who finds the beginning of the thousand years' reign in the coronation of Charlemagne in the year 800.

More correct than the interpretations of all these allegorists is that of the chiliasts, inasmuch as they do not maintain the recapitulation, so greatly cherished by the former, but rather leave the thousand-years' reign in the place in which it occurs in the Apocalyptic description of the entire end. Nor have all who upon the basis of the Apoc. seriously believed in the future entrance of the thousand-years' reign,[1] indulged in such sensuous portrayals of the Apocalyptic picture, as were peculiar to Cerinthus[2] and Papias,[3] and in general to heretics regarded as chiliasts. In accordance with the text, Justin and Irenaeus especially maintain the points, that the thousand-years' reign follows the first resurrection, that of the righteous, and that it occurs upon earth, as they properly regard the beloved city as Jerusalem. The thousand years, both these Fathers take literally.[4] Their interpretation of the former reference is more correct than that of Auberlen, who upon the presumption that "the earth, as yet not glorified, could not be the place for the glorified Church,"[5] infers that believers coming forth with Christ from the invisibility of heaven shall be invested with glorified bodies (ἡ ἀνάστ. ἡ πρ., ver. 5), and then are to return with Christ to heaven, in order thence to rule over the earth[6] — in connection with which the contradictory ver. 9 is not at all taken into consideration. In regard to the second, viz., the chronological reference, the ancients have seen more correctly than Bengel, who even traced two periods of one thousand years each, of which the former was to begin in the year 1836, with the destruction of the beast (xix. 20) and the binding of Satan, and the second was to begin with the loosing of the Devil, and to cease immediately before the end of the world (xx. 11).

The biblical-theological discussion of Rev. xx. 6, which John Gerhard[7] directs against the chiliasts,[8] he opens by recalling the fact that the expressions of the Apoc. must be explained the more certainly from the analogy of Holy Scripture, for the reason that it is a deutero-canonical book. Moreover, from this analogy it is maintained,[9] first, that the kingdom of Christ on earth never, even not at the end of days, is to be one that is to prevail externally; then that *all* the dead are to arise on *one* day; that there will be only *one* general resurrection of the dead at the coming of the Lord; therefore — so Gerhard evades by incorrectly interpreting what stands written, vv. 1-10 — the beginning of the thousand-years' reign is probably to be discerned in the time of Constantine, Gog and Magog are to be taken as Turks, etc. It is, however, rather to be decided, that neither the distinction made by the writer of the Apoc. between a first and a second resurrection, nor the insertion of a thousand-years' reign in the space of time thus obtained, nor the binding and loosing of Satan, and the attack of the heathen,

[1] Justin, *Dialogue with Trypho*, c. 81. See Introduction, p. 74 sq. Cf. Iren., *Adv. Haer.*, V. c 36: "John, therefore, with delight foresaw the first resurrection of the just, and their inheritance in the kingdom of the earth." Cf. V. c. 34 sq.

[2] Euseb., *H. E.*, III. 28.

[3] Iren., V. 33.

[4] Cf. Ps. xc. 4; Gen. ii. 17, v. 5. Adam is regarded as dying "on the day" of his eating, because he was not fully a thousand years old.

[5] p. 381. [6] p. 378 sqq.

[7] *Loci Theol.*, T. XX., p. 124. Ed. Cotta, Tüb., 1781.

[8] Cf. also Aug. Conf., Art. XVII.

[9] l. c., p. 121.

coincide with the eschatological statements of the Holy Scriptures in such a way that this Apocalyptic description could be understood in dogmatical seriousness; but the text itself makes us acquainted with an ideal description, whose particular features appear in harmonious connection only when the ideal character of the entire poetical picture is correctly estimated. What according to the real doctrinal prophecy of Scripture fall upon *one* day of the coming of the Lord, — viz., the resurrection of all the dead (among whom believers have indeed the priority,[1] but in no way in the sense as though a special period of time, as the thousand-years' reign, intervened between the resurrection of believers and that of other men) and the judgment of the world, — appears in the Apocalyptic description distributed into a long series of special, but coherent, acts. Upon this depends the vivid beauty of the Apocalyptic drama; but this poetical beauty is not only destroyed, but also perverted to a chiliastic want of judgment, if the ideal representation be taken as a theological statement of doctrine. The ideal character of the entire description is unambiguously presented, especially in that the *risen* saints have their camp in the *earthly* Jerusalem, and are attacked by *earthly* heathen nations; and yet the presence of heathen enemies, after all the dwellers on earth have been slain (xix. 21), is an inoffensive inconsistency, only if the treatment be neither in the one case nor the other of actual things. Klief. also approximates this view by avoiding the extension of time, and finding in the symbolical number only the idea indicated that the Lord's victory is one that is absolute. — A vain attempt to put in a favorable light chiliasm, supposed to be based upon the analogy of the Holy Scriptures, has recently been made by L. Kraussold.[2] He denies that in vv. 4 and 5 a resurrection of dead believers is indicated, and says:[3] "The souls of the righteous live before God and with God, — that is their first resurrection." But by thus ascribing to the righteous a twofold "resurrection," he emphatically asserts that the souls of the righteous, after the first resurrection, are still without glorified bodies, and at the same time understands the thousand-years' reign — of which these righteous souls are participants — as referring to a finally impending, actually historical time of the peaceful development of the kingdom of God on earth.[4]

At all events, Luthardt is in better agreement with the text, when correctly estimating vv. 4, 5, he finds the hope pledged of the future dominion of Christ and his glorified Church, over the rest of mankind, but is content with not being able to determine that which lies beyond the present order of things. [See Note XC., p. 474.] If the ideal character of the entire description be acknowledged, the numerical designation of a thousand years can be stated only in a schematical sense,[5] and can give no occasion, as even in Hengstenb., for an Apocalyptic reckoning. For there is no reason for ascribing to John the play-work by which the Talmudists and the Church Fathers, combining such passages as Isa. lxiii. 4, Zech. xiv. 7, Gen. i., with

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 23; 1 Thess. iv. 16; cf. Introduction, p. 85.

[2] *Das Tausend-jährige Reich u. die Offenb. Joh. Erl.*, 1863.

[3] p. 72.

[4] p. 75.

[5] Cf. Ps. xc. 4.

Ps. xc. 4, have inferred that the Messianic reign will last a thousand years,[1] or that the world will stand for six millenniums, and in the seventh millennium the eternal sabbath will follow.[2] [See Note XCI., p. 474.]

Vv. 11–15. The judgment of the world. All the dead appear before the enthroned God as Judge. They who are not written in the book of life are cast — together with Death and Hades — into the lake of fire.

Καὶ εἶδον. Designation of a new vision.[3] — θρόνον μέγαν λευκὸν. The *greatness*, as well as the *whiteness*, corresponding to the glory and holiness of the Judge sitting thereon, distinguishes this throne from that beheld previously (ver. 4). — τὸν καθήμενον ἐπ' αὐτοῦ. The one meant is not the Messiah,[4] but God speaking (xxi. 5, 6),[5] and designated at iv. 3.[6] Ew. ii. understands God and Christ.[7] — ἐδυγεν, cf. xvi. 20. Beng. explains the visible representation excellently: "Not from one place to another, but so that it has no longer a place." Cf. xxi. 1. ἀπῆλθαν, 2 Pet. iii. 10. — A new part of the vision proceeding still further (καὶ εἶδον, ver. 12), attests the view thereof, as all the dead[8] stand before the throne, and receive their sentence. — The ἑστῶτας ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου (ver. 12), in the connection of the whole, has a precisely similar relation to the description ver. 13 (κ. ἔδωκεν, κ.τ.λ.), as in ch. xv. ver. 1 has to ver. 6, since it is not reported more definitely (ver. 13) whence the dead who stand before the judgment-seat have come.[9] Bengel improperly regards the νεκρούς (ver. 12) as those who live to see the day of the *parousia*,[10] by understanding the νεκρούς figuratively,[11] and distinguishing this from the resurrection of those actually dead (ver. 13). — καὶ βιβλία ἠνοίχθησαν. Cf. Dan. vii. 10. In these books the ἔργα are to be regarded as written, in accordance with which men are judged.[12] — καὶ ἄλλο βιβλίον. This book, "the book of life," is only one; it contains the names of all those who[13] will be partakers of the eternal blessed life in the new Jerusalem.[14] According to the ethical fundamental view, which is supported especially by the promises, ch. ii., iii., both kinds of books are to be received in their inner relation to one another, that always according to the works which stand indicated in the βιβλίοις, the names of men are, or are not, found in the βιβλίον τῆς ζωῆς. [See Note XCII., p. 474.] As in ver. 12 the entire number of the dead was designated by a natural specification referring to their personality, so in ver. 13 this idea is presented by a specification of another sort; every place where there are any dead, gives them back. The more manifest this is as an exhaustive designation of *all* places of concealment of the dead, the more perverted appears the assertion of Hengstenberg and Ebrard,[15] that the θάλασσα means not the actual sea, but only "the sea of nations;"[16] but

[1] Cf. De Wette.
[2] Barnab., *Epistl.* c. 15.
[3] Vv. 1, 4, xix. 11, xvii. 19.
[4] Matt. xxvi. 31. Beng, Eichh., Ew. i., etc.
[5] Cf. i. 8.
[6] Cf. also Dan. vii. 9. Züll., De Wette, Hengstenb.
[7] "One of two in complete undividedness" (?).
[8] Concerning the exhaustive specification τ. νεκρ. τοὺς μεγάλους καὶ τοὺς μικροὺς, cf. xi. 18, xiii. 16.
[9] Züll., De Wette.
[10] Cf. also Hengstenb.
[11] Matt. viii. 22.
[12] Ver. 12*b*, 13. Cf. ii. 1, 5, 19, iii. 1, 8, 15.
[13] Ver. 15. Cf. iii. 5.
[14] xxi. 1 sqq.
[15] Cf. Augustine, etc.
[16] Hengstenb.

from the text (*καὶ ὁ θάν. κ. ὁ ἅδης, κ.τ λ.*, cf. ver. 14), it does not, therefore, follow that John seriously advocated the view according to which those contained in the sea had not reached Hades.[1] John does not indeed refer to a wandering of souls in a watery grave, but simply represents those lying dead in the sea as coming forth from the same. Thus, in ver. 13, that is described which, according to the analogy of ver. 5, may be termed the second resurrection. Since ver. 5 is understood as applying to all believers, this is only the resurrection of those who are to be delivered (ver. 15) to the second death, i.e., to eternal torture in the lake of fire. But from this it does not follow that ver. 12, in its clearly designated entirety of *all* the (risen, vv. 5 and 13) dead, does not comprise those saints;[2] but in the general judgment of the world, that is expressly affirmed of those saints which was already guaranteed to them by the first resurrection and their thousand-years' reign,[3] because their names were found written in the book of life.[4] But that the statement (ver. 15) expressly describes the fate only of the unbelieving, is natural for the reason that in this passage the entire judgment of condemnation is concluded, in connection with which, then, the description of the eternal glory of believers, to which the entire Apocalypse is directed,[5] may be given the more fully for their consolation and encouragement. — *καὶ ὁ θάνατος καὶ ὁ ᾅδης ἐβλήθησαν, κ.τ.λ.* Death and Hades, which (ver. 13)[6] are locally represented here,[7] appear personified as demoniacal powers, whose eternal removal[8] is a presupposition to the eternal life of the glorified.[9] [See Note XCIII., p. 474.] *οὗτος ὁ θάνατος ὁ δεύτερος ἐστιν.* "This death is the second" (death). Thus the correct reading is to be translated.[10] The apposition *ἡ λίμνη τοῦ πυρός*, construed according to sense, declares that the second death — which is followed by no resurrection — consists in the *βληθῆναι εἰς τ. λίμν. τ. πυρ.* (xxi. 8). The first death is easily understood as the end of the earthly life.

Notes by the American Editor.

LXXXVI. Ver. 2. *ὁ ὄφις ὁ ἀρχαῖος, κ.τ.λ.*

Luthardt calls attention to the accumulation here of names of Satan as being for the purpose of showing how necessary it is that he should be bound, the various names expressing different aspects of his character. He interprets the one thousand years as "a long period of the world, a day of God, with whom a thousand years are as one day." The binding is referred to his complete banishment from earth, so, that, while sin is still to exist in individuals, it is no longer to be a power forming a fellowship, and thus making a kingdom of sin and Satan.

[1] Cf. Achilles, Tat., V. 313: *λέγουσι δὲ τὰς ἐν ὕδασι ἀνηρημένας μηδὲ εἰς ᾅδου καταβαίνειν ὅλως, ἀλλ' αὐτοῦ περὶ τὸ ὕδωρ ἔχειν τὴν πλάνην* ["They say that those swallowed up in the waters do not entirely descend to Hades, but wander there about the water"]. Wetst., De Wette.

[2] Against Hengstenb., etc.

[3] Cf. ver. 6 with ver. 14 sq.

[4] Cf. xxi. 21.

[5] xxi. 1 sqq.

[6] Cf. i. 18.

[7] Cf. vi. 8.

[8] Cf. Isa. xxv. 8; 1 Cor. xv. 26.

[9] Cf. xxi. 4.

[10] Cf. the Critical Notes. The ℵ gives: This is the second death.

LXXXVII. Ver. 4. *κρίμα ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς.*

Gebhardt suggests, that, by *αὐτοῖς*, either no definite persons are intended, so that it was simply intended to express the idea, "there was a judgment;" or, as he thinks more probable, believers alive at the coming of Christ.

LXXXVIII. Ver. 4. *τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν πεπελεκισμένων, κ.τ.λ.*

Gebhardt: "The seer had, in his eye, two classes of the dead: first, those who have, for the gospel, surrendered their lives, — the witnesses of Jesus in a special sense (xvii. 6); not only those whose souls (vi. 9) are under the altar, but those also who come after (vi. 11; cf. xiii. 7, x. 15, xvi. 5, 6, xvii. 6, viii. 24); the full number of those who, according to the will of God, should die; until the completion of which, those already killed must rest in heaven (vi. 9–11); then, all other believers who, notwithstanding affliction and threatened death, remain faithful, and have died in the Lord (xiv. 13, xiii. 15, 16); in a word, all real Christians who have died either a violent or a natural death." The second resurrection he regards as including not only the condemned, but also the godly of the O. T. The emphasis here is sometimes thrown on *ψυχὰς*, as though this were sufficient to prove that the first resurrection of this chapter is spiritual. But, in this sense, had the souls of the martyrs ever died? How could they be said to live *again*, for that is the clear implication of ver. 5, if nothing more than a continuance of their spiritual life were indicated? Alford: "If in a passage where *two resurrections* are mentioned, where certain *ψυχαὶ ἔζησαν* at the first, and the rest of the *νεκροὶ ἔζησαν* only at the end of a specified period after that first, — if, in such a passage, the first resurrection may be understood to mean *spiritual* rising with Christ, while the second means *literal* rising from the grave, then there is an end of all significance in language, and Scripture is wiped out as a definite testimony to anything. If the first resurrection is spiritual, then so is the second, which, I suppose, none will be hardy enough to maintain; but, if the second is literal, so is the first." On the other hand, the difficulty must not be ignored, which is stated by Carpenter: "There will be faithless people during the millennium, — the nations to be deceived (ver. 8). Are we then to picture saints with glorified bodies living on the earth, which, at the same time, is tenanted by men and women still in the natural body?"

LXXXIX. Ver. 8. *τὸν Γὼγ καὶ Μαγώγ.*

Gebhardt: "Christianity has a period before it, and, indeed, a long one, of unimpeded, powerful, and blissful extension and authority in this present world; but this period must one day come to an end; the earth, in its present sin-ruined form, or rather state, cannot become the eternal or absolute state or manifestation of the Christian ideal world. Evil, though so long and so extensively kept in abeyance, will once more arouse itself for the struggle with the kingdom of God. After the course of a thousand years, the personal principle of all ungodliness will be loosed from his prison, and, according to the purpose of God, will again become active on earth; the Devil has still a footing there; evil yet exists, and must show its activity in opposition to God and his kingdom. Christianity has spread and triumphed even to the end of the earth; but there are yet heathens who are not subject to it, but who, enslaved and led by the Devil, seek to destroy it."

XC. Vv. 1-10.

Luthardt's very words, in the passage here alluded to by Düsterdieck, are important: "Not a carnal dominion (cf. *Augsburg Conf.*, xvii.), but a spiritual heavenly dominion of peace, and state of blessedness on earth, whereof, since it does not belong to the present order of things, we neither have nor can frame any idea, but should be content in that we shall always be with Christ, and this his Church shall be glorified before the world."

XCI. Vv. 1-10.

A condensed summary of the modern historical relations of this doctrine is found in Cremer and Zöckler's *Dogmatik* (in Zöckler's *Handbuch*, vol. ii. p. 762 sq.): "Neither Roman nor Greek Catholicism acknowledges a thousand-years' reign as still impending. In the grosser Judaizing sense in which the Anabaptists (Denk, Hetzer, Münzer, etc., recurring to the sensuous, voluptuous ideas of a Cerinthus, etc.) comprehended the chiliastic idea, it is rejected by the fundamental confession of the Reformation (see *Augsburg Confession*, art. xvii.; also the *Helvetic Confession*, ii. 11). The orthodoxy of the seventeenth century, as well as, in modern times, Hengstenberg (who makes the spiritually interpreted millennium coincide with the period 800–1806), Althaus, H. O. Kohler, Thomasius, Diedrich, Philippi, Kahnis, the "Missourians," consider each and every form of chiliasm incompatible with Scripture and Church doctrine. To them, all such doctrines are to be condemned: the *chiliasmus crassus* of the Anabaptists, as well as the moderate and refined types of doctrine of the two last centuries, viz., the *chiliasmus subtilissimus* of a Spener ("the hope of better times"), Vitringa, A. Hahn, Rothe, Löhe, Vilmar, v. Hofmann, Flörcke, Schoeberlein, Volck, Auberlen, Beck, Franck, Dorner, etc. [post-millennarians]; and the *chiliasmus subtilior* of a Petersen, Bengel, Crusius, Oetinger [pre-millennarians]."

XCII. Ver. 12. *βιβλία — ἄλλο βιβλίον.*

As Hengstenberg notes, there is a contrast. No name can be both in the *βιβλία* and the *ἄλλο βιβλίον*. When erased from the one, by the blood of the Lamb (1 John i. 9; Rev. xiii. 8), it is inserted in the other. Luthardt: "He whom God finds standing in life enters into eternal life." Thus the idea of the *ζωῆς* is not restricted to future life, but comprehends that also which then is both present and past.

XCIII. Ver. 14. *καὶ ὁ θάνατος καὶ ὁ ᾅδης, κ.τ.λ.*

Luthardt: "Death and the state of death that have hitherto prevailed have now an end, — not judged, but annihilated (1 Cor. xv. 26), — first for the Church, then for humanity; but for unbelieving humanity, to give place to eternal fire." Gebhardt: "Death is not simply destroyed; but as a diabolical power, the auxiliary or instrument of the evil one (cf. Heb. ii. 14, 15), it is abolished forever, made innocuous, condemned, and annihilated (cf. 1 Cor. xv. 26)."

CHAPTER XXI.

Ver. 1. Instead of *παρῆλθε* (Elz.), read *ἀπῆλθαν* (A, B, ℵ, Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]). — Ver. 2. The addition *ἐγὼ Ἰωάννης* to *καὶ εἶδον* (Elz.) is here incorrect. — Ver. 3. The sing. *λαὸς* (Beng., Tisch.) is sufficiently supported by B, 2, 4, 7, al., Verss. The plur. *λαοὶ* (A, ℵ, Elz., Lach., Tisch. IX. [W. and H.]), which does not belong in the O. T. tone of description, may, indeed, have been occasioned by the preceding *αὐτοὶ*. — Ver. 6. *Γέγοναν*. So A, Iren., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]. To this also leads the erroneous text-recension *γέγονα ἐγὼ τὸ* A *καὶ τ. Ω* in B, ℵ$_1$; while the *γέγονε ἐγώ εἰμι, κ.τ.λ.* (Rec.), originate in xvi. 17. — Ver. 9. Read, with A, ℵ, Verss., Beng., Lach., Tisch., *τὴν νύμφην, τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ ἀρνίου*. The various transpositions (Rec.: *τ. νύμφ. τ. ἀρν. τ. γυν.*) depend upon the purpose of combining the *τ. νύμφ.* with *τ. ἀρν.*; cf. xix. 7. — Ver. 16. Undoubtedly false is the effort at interpretation, *τοσοῦτόν ἐστιν* before *ὅσον* (Elz., rejected already by Beng.). — Ver. 23. The *ἐν* before *αὐτῇ* (Rec.) is, according to A, B, ℵ$_1$, al., to be deleted (Beng., d. N.). — Ver. 24. The Rec. *καὶ τὰ ἔθνη τῶν σωζομένων ἐν τῷ φωτὶ αὐτῆς περιπατήσουσι* is an interpretation. Beng. already has the correct text. — Ver. 27. Instead of *κοινοῦν* (Elz.), read *κοινὸν* (A, B, ℵ, al., Beng., Griesb., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]). The neuter *ποιοῦν* (B, Elz.) has been written because of the immediately preceding *πᾶν κοιν.* Before the correct *ποιῶν* (A, ℵ$_1$, Beng., Lach., Tisch.), however, the article (7, 8, 13, al., Tisch.) is probably not justified (A, ℵ$_1$, Beng., Lach.).

Now, finally, after all the enemies of the Lamb, and his believers, have been eternally removed, there appears (xxi. 1–xxii. 5) the final and supreme goal of all Apocalyptic prophecy, the eternal completion of the promised mystery of God,[1] that wherein all the promises which the Lord had caused to be declared to his Church are fulfilled, and to which he had directed all the hopes of his people in the midst of the afflictions of the world, and towards which, accordingly, also the deepest longing of believers extends.[2] Augustine already[3] remarks correctly: "When the judgment is finished, whereby he announced beforehand that the wicked are to be judged, *it remains for him to speak also concerning the good.*" The result of ver. 4, with complete clearness to him, is that the subject of treatment here is the eternal blessedness of the godly.[4] — Nevertheless, individual expositors have ruined also the description of ch. xxi. by allegorizing.[5]

[1] x. 7.

[2] Cf. xxii. 17, 20.

[3] l. c., c. 17.

[4] l. c., c. 14: "Things are said with such clearness concerning the future world and immortality, and the eternity of the saints, that we ought to seek for nothing manifest in the Holy Scriptures, if we suppose these to be obscure."

[5] Cf., e.g., Grot., who again stops with the times after Constantine, when the first earth no longer existed, because the earth no longer drank the blood of the martyrs, etc. Even Vitr. understands "a state of the Church to be

Vv. 1-8. John beholds a new heaven and a new earth, and the new Jerusalem when it descends from heaven. At this a mighty voice from heaven proclaims that this is the place where God will dwell with glorified men (vv. 1–4). The enthroned God himself testifies to this, by declaring at the same time the eternal ruin awarded to the godless; and, meanwhile, an angel commissions John to write down the present words of Divine revelation (vv. 5–8).

Οὐρανὸν καινὸν καὶ γῆν καινήν, κ.τ.λ. Cf. Isa. lxv. 17, lxvi. 22. The theological question as to whether the old world will pass away in such a manner, that from it, as a seed, the new will arise, or whether an absolutely new creation, after the entire annihilation of the old world, be referred to, is indeed to be decided least of all from the Apocalyptic description; yet this description[1] is not opposed to the former view, which, according to Scripture,[2] is more probable than the latter.[3] — καὶ ἡ θαλασσα οὐκ ἐστιν ἔτι. If the question be raised, why in the new world there will be no sea, such answers result — even though no allusion to the sea of nations be made here[4] — as that by Andreas, that the cessation of earthly separations renders also navigation, together with the sea, unnecessary; by Beda, that by the conflagration of the world the sea may be dried up; by De Wette and Luthardt, that the new world will be formed by fire, as the old world issued from the water; by Ewald: "This opinion seems to have been derived peculiarly from the horror of the deep sea which the Israelites, Egyptians, and ancient Indians had derived from love of the land, confined within which they lived;" by Zull., that also in paradise there would be no sea, in connection with which Ew. ii. and Volkm. besides remark that the sea and the abyss of hell belong together, and that, therefore, in the new world, the one can no more have a place than the other. But every combination of sea and hell is incorrect,[5] and according to xx. 10, 15, the writer of the Apocalypse actually refers to an abyss of hell eternally existing with the new heaven and the new earth. — The form of these answers of itself shows that the question is only put improperly. The text has the words referring to the sea in the place where the passing away of the entire old world is recalled; here that is expressly said which, xx. 11, was not expressly rendered prominent, that the sea also is no more, just as also the old earth and the old heaven. The tenor of the text, accordingly, does not forbid us thinking also of a new sea with the new earth.[6] [See Note XCIV., p. 485.] Ἱερουσαλὴμ καινήν. Also in Gal. iv. 26, there is a statement concerning the ἄνω Ἱερουσ., but so that this idea, proceeding from the contrast to the νῦν Ἱερουσ., only gives concretely the ideal view of the heavenly, spiritual, and free character of the Church of believers. But in John the matter is different in a twofold respect; since, in the first place, he regards the new Jerusalem

presented on earth at the last times," which he expects even before the judgment of the world.

[1] Cf. also 2 Pet. iii. 10 sqq.

[2] 1 Cor. xv. 42 sqq.; Rom. viii. 21; Matt. xix. 28.

[3] Cf. Andr.: κἀνταῦθα οὐκ ἀνυπαρξ.αν δηλοῖ τῆς κτίσεως, ἀλλ' ἀνακαινισμόν ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιον ["And here he does not reveal a non-existence of the creation, but a renewal to what is better"].

[4] Augustine, Hengstenb.

[5] Cf. xiii. 1 with xiii. 11, xi. 7 with ix. 2.

[6] Cf. also Beda.

only after the history of the world, when the heaven and earth also are made new, and then regards the new Jerusalem as descending from heaven to earth.[1] — *κατα3. ἐκ τ. οὐρ. ἀπὸ τ. θ.* The several prepositions, as iii. 12, mark, first of all, what is purely local, then (*ἀπὸ*) the idea resulting to the personal *τ. θ.*, that the holy city descends "from God," as God has prepared it and sent it down. The variation is different, e. g., in John xi. 1. In the expression xxi. 10, the local idea appears to prevail even in the *ἐκ τ. θ.* — *ἡτοιμασμέν ην.* "Prepared[2] as a bride adorned for her husband." Here already (cf. ver. 9) the idea, according to which the new Jerusalem is regarded as the dwelling-place (cf. ver. 3) of the Lamb's bride, i.e., of the Church of glorified believers,[3] passes over to that according to which the new Jerusalem itself — together with those dwelling therein — is regarded as the bride. While John sees the new Jerusalem descending from heaven, he hears a strong voice from heaven,[4] which immediately interprets this introductory vision (cf. ver. 9 sqq.) to the effect that this city descending from heaven is "the tabernacle of God with men," in which God himself shall dwell with men, and refresh them after all the sorrow they have experienced on earth, as this is henceforth no longer possible.[5] From the very beginning, therefore, the blessed mystery of the new Jerusalem is so interpreted that here the fulfilment is manifest (x. 7) of all that God had previously promised to his people through the prophets,[6] as it is, in truth, the complete realization of the communion between God and his people existing already in time (cf. ver. 7). — *ὁ θάνατος, κ.τ.λ.* Cf. xx. 14. — *πένθος.* As in xviii. 8, the special particular of lamentation for the dead is here presented, in connection with *ὁ θάνατος.* — *κραυγὴ.* The vehement cry, possibly, at the experience of such acts of violence as are indicated at xiii. 10, 17, ii. 10.[7] — *πονος.* As in the earthly life was endured with every form of *θλῖψις.* — *ὅτι πρῶτα ἀπῆλθαν.* The reason conditioning all (cf. vv. 1, 5). — What the heavenly voice interpreting the vision of John has announced, is now confirmed by the One himself who sits upon the throne,[8] and that, too, in a double declaration (*κ. εἶπεν*, vv. 5, 6), since he proclaims as his work (*Ἰδού, καινὰ ποιῶ πάντα*, ver. 5), what John beheld in ver. 1,[9] and had understood in ver. 4 (*ὅτι τ. πρῶτα ἀπῆλθαν*) from the heavenly voice to be the presupposition of the blessedness of believers indicated in vv. 3, 4, but then — after the angel, meanwhile,[10] had expressly commanded John (*κ. λέγει*, ver. 5*b*) to write down these trustworthy words of God himself, which contain the highest pledge of the future hope[11] — the promise mentioned already in ver. 3 sq. is expressed in the most definite manner (*Ἐγὼ τῷ διψῶντι, κ.τ.λ.*, ver. 6 sqq.) The latter, however, occurs in such a way that, in this declaration of God himself, there is found,

[1] Cf. iii. 12. Cf. Sohar, *Gen.*, p. 69: "God will renew his world, and build up Jerusalem, so as to make it descend into his midst, that it may never be destroyed." See Wetst. on Gal., l. c.; Schöttgen, *Diss. de Hieros. coelest.; Hor. Hebr.*, I. 1205 sqq.

[2] Cf. xix. 7.

[3] xix. 7 sq.

[4] Cf. xiv. 13.

[5] Cf. vii. 14–17.

[6] Cf. Ezek. xxxvii. 27; Isa. xxv. 8, lxv. 19.

[7] Bleek, Ew. Cf. Exod. iii. 7, 9; Esth. iv. 2.

[8] Cf. xx. 11.

[9] Cf. xx. 11.

[10] xix. 9, xxii. 6. Beng., Züll., Hengstenb.

[11] Cf. also xiv. 13.

besides the promise to the victor,[1] also the corresponding threatening of the unbelieving (ver. 8); and that this announcement, looking towards both sides, is introduced with an allusion to the majesty of the eternal God, because just upon this does the eternal end of all temporal development depend.[2] The *γέγοναν*, however,[3] which opens this entire declaration, puts it in immediate connection with the vision; for that which John had beheld, viz., the perishing of the old and the existence of the new world, is here proclaimed as having happened. — *δειλοῖς*. By this such Christians are meant as, in contrast with *ὁ νικῶν*, shun the sorrowful struggle with the world by denying the truth of the faith.[4] — *ἀπίστοις, κ.τ.λ.* The unbelieving are not Christians who have fallen from faith,[5] but the dwellers on earth hostilely disposed to the Christian faith,[6] to whom also[7] all the succeeding designations pertain. — *ἐβδελυγμένοις*, who have in themselves the *βδελύγματα*, xvii. 4 sq. — *τ. ψευδέσι*. Cf. ver. 27, xxii. 15. — *τὸ μέρος αὐτῶν, κ.τ.λ.* With the dat., possibly *ἡ λίμνη, κ.τ.λ.*, is to be expected; from this construction, however, there is a departure by the interposition[8] of the formula *τὸ μέρος* (sc. *ἔσται*), which then brings with it the genitive *αὐτῶν*.[9]

Ver. 9–xxii. 5. One of the seven vial-angels, another of whom had shown John the judgment of the great harlot,[10] now carries the seer to a high mountain, in order to afford him a close view of the new Jerusalem. Then there follows the special description which portrays in brightest colors the final goal of Christian hope, and thus puts the glorious end of what is to happen[11] at the close of the peculiarly revealed visions.

Vv. 9, 10. *Δεῦρο, κ.τ.λ.* The uniformity of the description makes prominent the contrast with the judgment presented to view (xvii. 1).[12] — *τὴν νύμφην, τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ ἀρνίου*. It belongs to the contrast with the woman representing the worldly city, that here the holy city, wherein the holy Church of God dwells, appears as the bride, the wife belonging to the Lamb.[13] — *ἀπήνεγκέν με*. Cf. xvii. 3; Ezek. xl. 2. — *μέγα καὶ ὑψηλόν*. "Great" in circumference must the mountain be in proportion to its height; but the height assures the seer of the complete view of the city spread out before him, which at all events does not lie upon the mountain.[14] — *καταβαίνουσαν, κ.τ.λ.* Hengstenb.[15] finds that described here for the first time in proper terms which previously designated, by way of introduction, ver. 2; but ver. 10 cannot have the same relation to ver. 2 as, e.g., ch. xv. ver. 5 has to ver. 1, for, in this connection, already at ver. 2 reference was made to the descending Jerusalem. The scene is thus to be regarded in the way that the descending of the city (ver. 2), which gives occasion for the speeches of vv. 3–8, has already begun, but ver. 10 proceeds further, so that, while the city is sinking down from heaven to earth, and here finds its place,

[1] The expression in itself marks already the parenetic intention.
[2] Cf. i. 8.
[3] Cf. xvi. 17.
[4] Beng., De Wette, Hengstenb.
[5] Ewald; cf. also Beng.
[6] Cf. xiii. 8, xvi. 2, 21.
[7] Cf. ix. 21.
[8] Cf. xx. 6.
[9] Matt. xxiv. 51. De Wette.
[10] xvii. 1.
[11] Cf. iv. 1.
[12] Cf. Ewald.
[13] Cf. ver. 2 and xix. 7.
[14] Against Hengstenb. and Luthardt.
[15] On ver. 1.

John is carried by the angel to the mountain, and thence gazes upon the city now found upon earth.

Ver. 11 begins the description itself[1] which first of all states its gleaming appearance. — *ἔχουσαν τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ.* What is most important, most peculiar, and what at the same time captivates the eye of the seer above all things, is the brilliancy which irradiates the whole city: "it has" in itself, it comprehends as dwelling and abiding within it,[2] the present glory of God himself.[3] The concrete character of this presentation is effaced by the reading of the ℵ: *ἀπὸ τ. θ. — τ. φωστὴρ, κ.τ.λ.* The description now proceeds further independently of the *ἔδειξεν*; only the first item of the description (*ἔχουσαν τ. δόξ. τ. θ.*) had been given in the formal connection of the original construction.[4] From ver. 23,[5] it follows, that *ὁ φωστὴρ αὐτῆς*[6] is not distinct from the *δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ*;[7] the source of light for the city is the *δόξα* of God himself present therein.[8] — *ὁμοιος λίθῳ, κ.τ.λ.* The appearance of God was illustrated similarly. — *κρυσταλλίξοντι.* Cf. *Psellus* in Wetst.: *ἡ ἰάσπις φύσει κρυσταλλοειδὴς.*[9]

Vv. 12–21. The wall and the gates of the city. The harmonious proportions are given,[10] according to the holy number twelve of the O. T. people of God. — *ἀγγέλους δώδεκα.* Correctly, Bengel: "They keep watch, and serve as an ornament. More definite references dare not be sought; as soon as we reflect that the new Jerusalem is no longer threatened by enemies, and therefore needs no watchmen of its gates, explanations result like that of Hengstenb., viz., that these angels symbolize the Divine protection against enemies "which could be conceived of only by an imagination filled with terrors, proceeding from the Church militant." — *ὀνόματα ἐπιγεγραμμένα, κ.τ.λ.* It does not follow that John wanted this idea, based upon Ezek. xlviii. 31 sqq., to be understood as it occurs in Jewish theology,[11] viz., that members of one tribe could make use of only one door. — As the walls on all four sides have each three gates (ver. 13), it follows (ver. 14) that there are twelve sections of the wall, each of which is supported by a *θεμέλιος*; four of these are to be regarded as massive corner-stones, since these support the corner-pieces which extend from the third gate of the one side to the first gate of the following side. The twelve corner-stones lie open to view, at least so far that their splendor can be perceived,[12] and the inscriptions found thereon, viz., the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb, can be read. In explanation of the latter idea, Calov., etc., have properly appealed to Eph. ii. 20. [See Note XCV., p. 485.]

Vv. 15–17. The angel who shows John the city[13] gives him a clear view of its dimensions by[14] actually measuring them before the eyes of the seer.[15] — *μέτρον κάλαμον χρυσοῦν.* Cf. xi. 1, where, however, the *κάλαμος* is not expressly designated as *μέτρον*.[16] The measuring-reed is "golden" because of the

[1] Cf. Ezek. xl. sqq.
[2] Cf. ver. 3.
[3] Ver. 23, xv. 8.
[4] Cf. Winer, p. 499.
[5] Cf. also Ezek. xliii. 2.
[6] Cf. Gen. i. 14.
[7] Against Züll., according to whom the Messiah is irradiated in the *φωστὴρ*.
[8] De Wette, Hengstenb., Ebrard.
[9] ["The jasper, in nature crystalline."]
[10] Cf. Ezek. xlviii. 30 sqq.
[11] Cf. De Wette.
[12] Cf. ver. 19 sq.
[13] Cf. ver. 9.
[14] Cf. Ezek. xl. 5 sqq.
[15] Bengel, Ewald, De Wette.
[16] Ezek. xlii. 16 sqq.

glory, not indeed of the measuring angel,[1] but of the objects to be measured (ver. 18). These are presented in the series designated in ver. 15; viz., the city (ver. 16), the walls (vv. 17–20), the gates (ver. 21). That the city lies (*κεῖται*, cf. iv. 2) four-cornered, and, indeed, with right angles and equal length and breadth, and, therefore, that its outline forms a perfect square,[2] John recognizes already (ver. 16*a*) even before the angel begins to measure. But the angel also establishes the length of the particular sides: *καὶ ἐμέτρησεν τὴν πόλιν, κ.τ.λ.* (ver. 16*b*). The words by themselves might signify that the entire circuit of the city[3] amounted to twelve thousand stadia (*ἐπὶ σταδίους*),[4] so that each of the four equal sides would measure three thousand stadia; but as the equality of the length and the breadth has been designated from the very beginning, it is more probable that the twelve thousand stadia which were actually measured are meant as the mass lying at the foundation of the entire building, which, according to ver. 16*c*, applies also to the height of the city; for that by the closing words (*καὶ τὸ μῆκος — ἴσα ἐστίν*), dimensions actually identical are given for the length, breadth, and height of the city, is to be denied neither on account of ver. 17, nor on account of xxii. 2,[5] for the reason that the idea of the city thus resulting is a monstrosity.[6] The city appears, therefore, as an enormous cube, which measures in length, breadth, and height, each, twelve thousand stadia.[7] [See Note XCVI., p. 000.] The height "of the city" (ver. 16*c*) is not the height of the walls (ver. 17), as Bengel also admits, who affirms, on this account, that the one hundred and forty-four cubits (ver. 17) are equal to the twelve hundred stadia (ver. 16); but the idea of the height of the city as a whole, i.e., of the mass of houses contained in it, is given, ver. 16*c*.[8] — In ver. 17 there follows the measuring of the walls, viz., of their height, since the length of the walls is identical with the length and breadth of the city[9] (ver. 16). The specification of one hundred and forty-four cubits[10] is to be understood according to the common "measure of a man" (*μέτρον ἀνθρώπου*),[11] "which is the measure of the angel." The words *ὅ ἐστιν ἀγγέλου* cannot say that, in the present case, the angel has made use of the ordinary human measure,[12] but the measurements of the angel and of man are made equal,[13] without venturing, against the expression *μέτρον ἀνθρώπου*, to declare[14] that the measure of glorified men is here regarded.[15] — In comparison with the height of the city (ver. 16), the wall appears very low, even though this is extraordinarily

[1] Hengstenb.

[2] Cf. Ezek. xlviii. 16.

[3] Vitr., Eichh., Ew. i., Volkm.

[4] Cf. Winer, p. 381.

[5] Where the streets are spoken of.

[6] Against De Wette, who explains the *ἴσα* in reference to the height, viz., of the walls, according to his misconception of ver. 16*c*, as "uniform," because the walls are everywhere 144, i.e., 12 × 12 cubits high.

[7] i.e., 300 German miles [a German mile being equal to 4.611 English and American statute miles, the measure would be, according to our computation, nearly 1,400 miles]. Andr., Beng., Züll., Hengstenb., Rinck; also Ew. ii., who at the same time alludes to the fact that this uniformity was found in the ancient Mosaic sanctuary only in the holy of holies. Cf. also Luthardt.

[8] Hengstenb.

[9] If the thickness of the walls were meant (Luther, gloss), it would necessarily be expressed.

[10] Not 144,000, Ew. ii., p. 349.

[11] Cf. xiii. 18.

[12] De Wette.

[13] Hengstenb.

[14] Ebrard.

[15] Matt. xxii. 30.

high when compared with earthly relations.[1] The reason is not that the walls are to form only a bulwark put about the city like a temple,[2] and, besides, that the light proceeding from the city is not to be obstructed by a high wall;[3] but it may be indicated that for keeping off every thing relatively unclean (cf. ver. 27) the relatively low walls are sufficient, because, indeed, a violent attack is perfectly inconceivable.

The splendor of the wall of the city itself (ver. 18), of the twelve foundation stones (ver. 19), and of the twelve gates (ver. 21), is described with the greatest glory whereof human fantasy is capable. — *ἡ ἐνδόμησις τ. τειχ. αὐτ.* In Josephus,[4] a stone mole built in the sea, which is intended to break the force of the waves, is thus named.[5] Here the proper wall is designated, so far as it stands upon the foundation stones;[6] but the technical expression compounded with *ἐν*[7] has its justification here, because the higher masonry is rooted, as it were, in the ground. — Beside the wall, in ver. 18*b*, the city as a whole, i.e., the mass of houses,[8] whose height was given, ver. 16*c*, is mentioned, because this enormous mass, projecting above the walls, must now first be described before the individual parts (vv. 19–21) can come more accurately into consideration. The city consists of "pure gold, like unto clear glass." Already Andreas has correctly remarked that the addition, *ὅμοιον ὑάλῳ καθαρῷ.*,[9] represents the gold as "transparent," which had been already sufficiently designated by *καθαρόν* as free from every mixture, so that in this respect it did not require any special comparison with the purity of glass,[10] although Andreas makes a mistake in referring this to the *διαυγὲς καὶ λαμπρὸν* of the inhabitants of the city.[11] But it is inconceivable that John, in order to illustrate the inexpressible glory of the city descending from heaven, transgresses the natural limits of the earthly, and therefore here, e.g., represents a transparent gold as the material whereof the houses of the new Jerusalem consist, as it is unjustifiable to pervert the beautiful pictures which spring from the sanctified fantasy of the seer into theological propositions, and, accordingly, to expect that gold now opaque shall actually, in the world to come, receive "the nature of a precious stone, transparency."[12] — The description, ver. 19, turns to particular details, and that, too, to the foundations of the walls. With all precious stones are they "adorned,"[13] but not in such a way as possibly only to be set with precious stones, but[14] every individual *θεμέλιος* consists of an enormous precious stone.[15] — As the twelve *θεμέλιοι* have nothing to do with the number of the Israelitish tribes,[16] so that artificial expedient whereby the stones mentioned in ver. 19 sq. are brought into an assumed relation[17]

[1] Cf. ver. 12.
[2] Cf. Ezek. xl. 5.
[3] Züll.
[4] *Ant.*, xv. 9.
[5] *ἡ δὲ ἐνδόμησις, ὅσην ἐνεβάλετο κατὰ τῆς θαλάσσης, κ.τ.λ.* ["The building, as much as he cast into the sea"].
[6] Wetst., De Wette, Hengstenb., Bleek.
[7] Instead of this, another, possibly *ἐπιδόμησις*, is not afforded.
[8] Hengstenb., Ebrard, Ew. ii.
[9] Cf. also ver. 21.
[10] Against Beng., Hengstenb.
[11] Cf. also Vitr., etc.
[12] Ebrard.
[13] *παντὶ*. Cf. xviii. 12.
[14] Cf. Isa. liv. 11 sq.
[15] Andr., Beng., De Wette, Hengstenb., Ebrard.
[16] Cf. ver. 14.
[17] Cf. especially Züll., *Excurs.* II., p. 456 sqq.; also Ew. ii., Luthardt, Volkm.

to those which the high priest wore in his breastplate, is to be discarded as decidedly as the vain attempt to assign individual jewels to the individual apostles.[1] De Wette and Hengstenb. also, with propriety, deny that an intentional order is to be sought in the precious stones here mentioned, which, according to Ebrard, will not become clear until in eternity. — *ἴασπις.* Like the entire *ἐνδόμησις* of the walls. Cf. iv. 3. — *σάπφειρος,* סַפִּיר, Exod. xxiv. 10, xxviii. 18. The descriptions of the ancients,[2] especially of Pliny,[3] apply not so much to our azure, transparent sapphire, as rather to our dark-blue opaque lazuli, *lapis lazuli.*[4] — *χαλκηδών.* Possibly corresponding to the שְׁבוֹ, Exod. xxviii. 19, where, however, the LXX., with whom the name *χαλκηδών* does not occur, have *ἀχάτης.* Even Pliny is not acquainted with the name chalcedony. On the agate occurring in various forms and compositions, cf. Pliny, *H. N.*, xxxvii. 54. — *σμάραγδος.* Cf. iv. 3. In the LXX,[5] *σμάρ.* stands for the Hebr. בָּרֶקֶת. Cf. Plin., l. c., c. xvi.: "The third rank is ascribed to emeralds for reason. The appearance of no color is more pleasing, since there is nothing whatever greener than they."[6] — *σαρδόνυξ.* הֶלֶם, Exod. xxxix. 11; Ezek. xxviii. 13. Plin., l. c., c. 23: "Formerly by sardonyx, as appears from the name, was understood the brilliancy in the sard, i e, that in the flesh beneath man's finger-nail, and translucent on both sides." — *σάρδιον.* Cf. iv. 3. — *χρυσόλιθος.* Exod. xxviii. 20, LXX., for תַּרְשִׁישׁ. The chrys. of the ancients, which Plin., l. c., c. 42, describes as golden-yellow,[7] is probably identical with our topaz. — *βήρυλλος.* LXX., Exod. xxviii. 20; Ezek. xxviii. 13 (*βηρύλλιον*) for שֹׁהַם, which Gen. ii. 12 renders by *ὁ λίθος ὁ πράσινος.* The stone is in color *γλαυκίζων,*[8] or, as Pliny, l. c., c. 20, says, most appropriately: "They imitate the greenness of the pure sea." — *τοπάζιον.* Exod. xxviii. 17; Ezek. xxviii. 13; Job xxviii. 19, LXX., for פִּטְדָה. Our topaz is yellow and transparent, so as to correspond with the description of Strabo;[9] while the declarations of Pliny, l. c., c. 32, refer to our chrysolite. — *χρυσόπρασος.* This does not occur in the LXX. Pliny, l. c., c. 20, presents the chrysoprasus with the chrysoberyl, but ascribes to it a paler golden color than to the latter. — *ὑάκινθος.* In the LXX. the Cod. Alex. has this name, where Cod. Vat. gives *λιγύριον*[10] for לֶשֶׁם. Pliny, l. c., c. 41, compares it with the amethyst, and remarks: "This is the difference, viz., that the violet shining in the amethyst is diluted in the jacinth." — *ἀμέθυστος.* Exod. xxviii. 19, LXX., for אַחְלָמָה. Pliny, l. c., c. 40, reckons the amethyst as a purple gem; he says especially of the Indian amethysts, the most distinguished: "They have the absolute color *purpurae felicis;*" but, even to the inferior kinds, he ascribes a similar color and transparency.[11] — The twelve gates consist each (*ἀνὰ εἷς ἕκαστος*)[12] of one

[1] Andr., Beng., etc.

[2] Cf. Wetst.

[3] *H. N.*, xxxvii. 39: "For in sapphires the gold shines with azure points. Of sapphires, white with purple, yet among the Medes the best are nowhere transparent."

[4] Cf., in general, Winer, *Realw.*, ii. 350 sqq.

[5] Exod. xxviii. 17; Ezek. xxviii 13.

[6] See also Wetst.

[7] "Shining with golden brilliancy."

[8] Bluish-green, Epiphan. in Wetst.

[9] *διαφανὴς, χρυσοειδὲς ἀπολάμπων φέγγος* ["diaphanous, emitting a radiance like gold"].

[10] Exod. xxviii. 19; Ezek. xxviii. 13.

[11] "A violet color shines through all."

[12] Cf. Winer, p. 234.

pearl. Cf. *Bava Bathra*, p. 75, 1: "God will give gems and pearls thirty cubits long and just as broad, and will hollow them to the depth of twenty cubits and the breadth of ten, and place them in the gates of Jerusalem," etc.[1] — The streets of the city — ἡ πλατεῖα τ. πόλ. designates in general all the streets of the city,[2] not the market-place,[3] also not the chief street leading into the city,[4] because, in the entire description of the city, nothing is said of what lies outside the walls — consist, like the houses which rise from the streets (ver. 18), of pure gold, which is as transparent "as transparent glass."

Ver. 22 sq. The proper glory of the city is further described. It has no temple, because there is no need of one; for its temple is God himself and the Lamb. Nor does God, together with the Lamb, have a special dwelling-place in the city, but it is filled with the δόξα of God, everywhere present in it,[5] and the city itself is indeed the bride of the Lamb[6] who is immediately present to all the inhabitants of the city.[7] — They, therefore, need not the light of sun and moon; for[8] the δόξα of God and the Lamb itself fill them with light.[9] Here where, indeed, the description implies that the δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ corresponds to the sun, and that of the Lamb to the moon,[10] it does not follow that the same distinction is made also in ver. 11,[11] because there it is only a φωστήρ that is mentioned, viz., the δόξα τ. θ. appears as φωστήρ, because it φωτίζει (ver. 23).

Vv. 24–27. The men who enter into the city. — The description is based throughout upon O. T. prophecies,[12] so that it definitely marks how the mystery of God, which He had long since promised through the prophets, finds then its fulfilment.[13] Hereby the *future* expression, now employed by John, is explained, while the aor., written besides in ver. 23*b*, reports what has been beheld.[14] In the tone and language of the ancient prophets, John describes the people who are to find entrance into the future city. In general, as has been said, ver. 27, in a decisive way, they are only such as are written in the book of life;[15] but in vv. 24–26, the Gentiles are expressly designated as those who, according to the ancient prophecies, are to find admission into the city. Thus by this statement, derived from the ancient prophetical declarations, the ideas of those expositors are not justified who conceive of the "heathen" and "kings," as dwelling outside of the city,[16] or who even attempt to determine what had been the moral condition, during their earthly life, of the heathen admitted now into the new Jerusalem.[17] The essentially parallel description, vii. 9 sqq., leads to the fact that believers from the heathen are to be regarded as entitled to an abode in

[1] See Wetst.
[2] De Wette, Hengstenb., Ebrard.
[3] Beng. [4] Züll.
[5] Cf. vv. 3, 11.
[6] Ver. 9. Cf. xix. 9.
[7] Cf. xxii. 3 sq., iii. 20.
[8] Cf. ver. 11.
[9] Cf. Isa. lx. 19 sq.
[10] Grot., Ewald, De Wette.
[11] Züll.
[12] Isa. lx. 3, 11; Ps. lxxii. 10.
[13] Cf. x. 7.
[14] Cf. xxii. 3 sqq. with ver. 1 sq.; also xviii. 9, 15, with xviii. 17.
[15] Cf. xx. 15.
[16] Ewald, De Wette, Bleek, etc.
[17] Storr., *Diss.* II. in *Apoc. quaedam loca*, p. 355: "Provided, according to the measure of their ability and knowledge, they were devoted to godliness, truth, and right." See *Comment. theolog. edit. a Velthus., Kuin. et Rup.*, vol. v. Likewise Ebrard.

the new Jerusalem; but the peculiar character of the description is conditioned by the O. T. prototypes, upon which John depends, although in its perspective, that which occurs in the earthly period of the Messianic time — as the conversion of the heathen, which is represented by the heathen coming to the earthly Jerusalem, and bringing presents — does not appear definitely separated from that which, to N. T. prophecy, having the first appearance of the Lord back of it, lies only on the other side of the second coming of the Lord. Altogether inapplicable is the remark made in critical interests,[1] that the writer of the Apocalypse announces his anti-Pauline-Judaizing view, by making the distinction between heathen and Jews continue, even at the completion of the kingdom of God, in opposition to Gal. iii. 28, 1 Cor. xv. 28. It is, indeed, directly stated how the natural distinction is *no longer* applicable, since the heathen, just as the Jews, receive full citizenship in the new Jerusalem, and, in like manner, participate in the blessed glory of the holy city. Cf. xxii. 2. Emphasis on works also in the Apoc.[2] is not intensified to a bold opposition to Paul.[3] Cf. Rom. ii. 9 sqq.; 2 Cor. v. 10. — *διὰ τοῦ φωτὸς αὐτῆς.* With correct meaning, Andr. explains *ἐν τῷ φωτί*; but the expression gives rather the pictorial view as to how the heathen pursue their way through the light that radiates from the city shining in the *δόξα* of God (cf. ver. 23).[4] — *τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν*, viz., *τῶν βασιλεών.*[5] Not until ver. 26 is any thing said of the *δόξα κ. τιμ. τῶν ἐθνων.*[6] — *καὶ οἱ πυλῶνες, κ.τ.λ.* The constant standing-open of the gates is admissible, for the reason that there is no night, and therefore the bringing-in of glorious gifts (ver. 26) need not be interrupted.[7] To *οἴσουσι*,[8] an impersonal subject is to be supplied,[9] and not *οἱ βασιλεῖς.*[10] — *πᾶν κοινὸν.* Cf. Acts x. 14. — *ποιοῦν βδέλυγμα καὶ ψεῦδος.* Cf. xvii. 4 sq., xxi. 8, xxii. 15. The more definitely the sins of the heathen are mentioned as the reason for their exclusion from the holy city, the more significant it is to reckon the heathen nations and kings of the earth designated, ver. 24 sqq., among those who are written in the book of life. For they also enter into the city, bringing gifts, and that, too, as citizens who are to remain therein. Thus the innate universalism of the genuine ancient-prophetic Apocalyptics which lies at the foundation also of passages like v. 9, vii. 9, is expressed the more pregnantly, because the heathen, received into the new Jerusalem, are designated in the same words (*τὰ ἔθνη, οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς*) as were employed by ch. xiii. in the expression standing for the heathen world worshipping the beast.

[1] Hilgenfeld, Introduction, p. 449.
[2] xx. 12, etc.
[3] Hilgenfeld *ut supra.*
[4] Hengstenb. Cf., on the other hand, De Wette: "By means of its light."
[5] De Wette, Bleek.
[6] Cf. Isa. lxvi. 12.
[7] Cf. Isa. lx. 11.
[8] Cf. xii. 6, x. 11.
[9] Luther, Bengel, De Wette, Hengstenb., Ew. ii., etc.
[10] Ew. i., Züll.

Notes by the American Editor.

XCIV. Ver. 1. *ἡ θάλασσα οὐκ ἔστιν ἔτι.*

Carpenter: "The sea has played an important part in the symbolism of the book. Out of the sea, rose the wild beast (xiii. 1); the purple-clad Babylon sat enthroned upon many waters (xvii. 1); the restless, tumultuous ocean, now discordant with its clamorous waves, now flooding the earth in confederate force, — the troubled sea of evil, which cannot rest, and which casts up but mire and dirt (Isa. lvii. 21), is nevermore to be found on the face of that earth, or near that city, whose peace is as a river, and whose righteousness as the waves of the sea (Isa. xlviii 18), and whose inhabitants are delivered from 'the waves of this troublesome world.'" Gebhardt: "Most probably, by leaving out the sea, he simply wishes to express the new in the fuller sense of the word, the ideal or the perfection of the new world; inasmuch as, on account of its dangers, and the many deaths in it (cf. xx. 13), but chiefly because of its being repugnant to all the ancients, he regarded the sea an unpleasant feature, and a prominent imperfection of the present state." Düsterdieck's idea of a new sea with the new earth has been poetically expressed by Bonar: —

"Only all of gloom and horror,
Idle wastes of endless brine,
Haunts of darkness, storm, and danger, —
These shall be no longer thine.
Backward ebbing, wave and ripple,
Wondrous scenes shall then disclose;
And, like earth's, the wastes of ocean
Then shall blossom as the rose."

XCV. Ver. 14. *ὀνόματα τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων.*

Calov.: "The apostles, who, by their living voice and literary records, founded the Church, and upon whose doctrine and writings it rests as on an immovable foundation." Hengstenberg: "The twelve apostles are the most noble bulwark of the Church, the chief channel through which the preserving grace of God flows forth to it. If, even in the new Jerusalem, they are the foundation on which the security of the Church against all conceivable dangers depends, they must also be the bulwark through all periods of the Church militant. But this passage, and that of Matt. xix. 28, where the twelve apostles appear in the 'regeneration,' — the new Jerusalem, — as the heads of the Church, are a sufficient answer to those who maintain that the apostolate is a continuous institution, and expect salvation for the Church by subjection to pretended new apostles. The Lord himself, and the disciple whom he loved, knew only of *twelve* apostles. The twelve apostles are forever. That in the corner-stone, besides the apostles, there are also prophets, is only a seeming variation. For that the prophets are not those of the O. T., but of the N. T., and personally identical with the apostles, is clear from the parallel passages iii. 5, iv. 11."

XCVI. Ver. 16. *ἴσα ἐστίν.*

Alford: "Düsterdieck's idea that the houses were three thousand stadii in height, while the wall was only one hundred and forty-four cubits, is too absurd

to come at all into question. The words are open, this last consideration being taken into account, to two interpretations: (1), That the city, including the hill or rock on which it was placed, and which may be imagined as descending with it, formed such a cube as seems here described; or (2), That there is some looseness of use in the word ἴσα, and that we must understand that the length and breadth were equal to each other, and the height equal all round. Of these two, I prefer the former, as doing no violence to the words, and, at the same time, recalling somewhat the form of the earthly Jerusalem on its escarpment above the valley of the Kedron." On the other hand, Gebhardt: "According to Düsterdieck, the relative lowness of the wall is indicative of the security of the city (comp. Isa. liv. 74); and very justly do we see in the size of the city, and the height of the walls, so prominently expressed, a symbol of its safety from every danger." Hengstenberg: "Manifestly the height, and the length, and the breadth are equal; and nothing is said concerning the relation of the houses to one another. For, according to this conception, the height of the city would be altogether undetermined."

CHAPTER XXII.

Ver. 1. ποταμὸν ὑδ. ζ. λαμπρὸν ὡς κρ. So A, B, ℵ, al., Verss., Beng., Griesb., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]. The καθαρόν, which the Rec. has before ποταμ., is without attestation. — Ver. 2. Instead of ἐντεῦθεν καὶ ἐντεῦθεν (Elz., Beng.; cf. John xix. 18), read ἐντ. κ. ἐκεῖθεν (A, B, al., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]). The ἑνα before ἕκαστον (Elz., Beng.) is rightly deleted by Griesb. — Ver. 3. κατάθεμα. So A, B, ℵ$_1$, al., Beng., Griesb., the moderns. Incorrectly, Elz.: κατανάθεμα; cf. Matt. xxvi. 74. — Ver. 5. The ἐκεῖ after ἔσται (Elz., Beng.) is without attestation. According to A, ℵ, al., Griesb., Lach., Tisch. IX. [W. and H.] have written ἔτι; Tisch. has written this also after B. καὶ οὐ χρεία λύχνου καὶ φωτός. So Tisch., according to B. This appears to be the *mater lectionis;* yet Lach., who writes καὶ οὐχ ἕξουσιν (ℵ: οὐκ ἔχουσιν) χρείαν φωτὸς λύχνου καὶ φωτὸς ἡλίου, has in his favor the testimony of A and ℵ; while the rec. κ. χρείαν οὐκ ἔχουσι λύχνου καὶ φωτὸς ἡλίου is unattested. Tisch. IX. [W. and H.]: κ. οὐκ ἔχ. χρείαν φωτὸς λύχν. κ. — φωτίσει. The fut. is certain, although the discrimination as to the form φωτίσει (A, al., Beng., Lach.), or φωτιεῖ, is difficult. The pres. (Elz.) has only unimportant witnesses. ἐπ' αὐτούς. So A, ℵ, Beng., Griesb., the moderns. The ἐπὶ is lacking in B, Elz. — Ver. 6. τῶν πνευμάτων τῶν προφητῶν. So, correctly (A, B, ℵ, al.) already, Beng., Griesb. The modification τ. ἁγίων προφ. (Elz.) is without critical value. — Ver. 8. After κ. ὅτε ἤκουσα, Tisch. has καὶ ὅτε ἴδον (B, al.). This is, at all events, more correct than the Rec. καὶ ἔβλεψα (so ℵ), which Lach., Tisch. IX., have indorsed, although A has κ. ἔβλεπον. But even this form is liable to suspicion because of its correspondence with the preceding βλέπων. — Ver. 10. The ὅτι before ὁ καιρὸς (Rec., Beng.) is certainly a proposed interpretation; as such, the γὰρ also, after ὁ καιρ., appears suspicious, although its omission (Griesb., Tisch.) is forbidden by A, B, ℵ, al., Verss. (Lach., Tisch. IX.). — Ver. 11. ὁ ῥυπαρὸς ῥυπαρευθήτω. So A, al., Beng., Griesb., Tisch. The form, supported by Orig. and ℵ, ῥυπανθήτω (Lach., Tisch. IX. [W. and H.]) is the more usual, and may accordingly indeed have the force of an explanation. The Rec. ὁ ῥυπῶν ῥυπωσάτω is feebly attested. Instead of δικαωθήτω (Elz.), Beng. already wrote δικαιοσύνην ποιησάτω (A, B, ℵ, al.). — Ver. 12. ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ. So A, ℵ, 21, Syr., Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]. Whether B thus read, or have αὐτοῦ ἔσται (Elz., Beng.), is not established; cf. Tisch. — Ver. 14. The Rec. ποιοῦντες τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ is therefore to be preferred (cf. De Wette) because the reading πλύνοντες τὰς στολὰς αὐτῶν (Lach., Tisch. [W. and H.]), advocated by A, ℵ, 7, 38, Verss., appears to have the purpose which is clearly expressed in the text of Andr. (τ. ἐντ. ἐμοῦ); viz., not to allow the speech of Christ (vv. 13, 16) to be interrupted by an intervening speech of John. — Ver. 16. ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις. It is certain that this reading, supported by Beng., Tisch. (cf. also De Wette, etc.), depends only upon the witnesses 4, 11, 12, 47, 48, Arm., al.; while the ἐν (A, al., Verss., Lach.), as well as the ἐπὶ (B, ℵ, al., Syr., Elz., Tisch. IX. [W. and H.]), was apparently interpolated because the address of Christ to the churches was not understood. So the exposition. — Ver. 21. The additions ὑμῶν and τῶν ἁγίων

(B, al.) to *πάντων*, and the *Ἀμήν* at the close (Elz.), were properly rejected already by Beng. The subscription, which in A runs *ἀποκάλυψις Ἰωάννου*, is entirely lacking in B, al.

Vv. 1-5. The continuation (*καὶ ἔδειξέν μοι*, cf. xxi. 9 sq) and completion of the description of the glory prepared for believers in the new Jerusalem. Here, also,[1] in connection with the statement of what John beheld, the express admonition occurs corresponding to the paracletic purpose of the entire revelation (cf. ver. 12 sqq.), that only the servants of God, the victors (chs. ii., iii.), can attain that blessedness.

πόταμον ὕδατος ζωῆς, κ.τ.λ. In this paradise of God,[2] there is a stream[3] whose water is "water of life," so that they who drink thereof[4] receive life through this water. The description depends, as already Ezek. xlvii. 1 sqq., Zech. xiv. 8, upon the prototype, Gen. ii. 10. — *ἐκπορευόμενον, κ.τ.λ.* Cf. iv. 6. The throne which belongs to God and the Lamb[5] is the source of this stream, for only through the mediation of Christ as the Lamb, is the participation of believers in the eternal life of God inferred. [See Note XCVII., p. 494.] — *ἐν μέσῳ τῆς πλατείας, κ.τ.λ.* It is, in a formal respect, very harsh if the *ἐν μέσῳ* be referred only to *τ. πλατ. αὐτ.*,[6] while the *κ. τ. ποτ.* depends upon the succeeding *ἐντεῦθεν καὶ ἐκεῖθεν*; it is more natural[7] to refer the *ἐν μέσῳ* to both *τ. πλατ. αὐτ.* and *κ. τ. ποτ.*, so that the additional designation *ἐντ. κ. ἐκεῖθ.* more accurately declares that the trees, on both sides of the river, stand on the space lying between the street and the river, i.e., on the right and the left banks.[8] — *τῆς πλατείας.* John has in view a particular street, the main street through which flows the one particular river. — *ξύλον ζωῆς.* Cf. ii. 7. The expression designates the entire mass of trees in general.[9] — *ποιοῦν καρποὺς δώδεκα, κ.τ.λ.* Cf. Ezek. xlvii. 12. The meaning is correctly described already by Andr.: *ἀδιάλειπτον τὴν τῶν καρπῶν — ἐκφυσιν.*[10] In eternity, the continually growing fruits of the tree of life serve the blessed for food. See similar descriptions of the rabbins in Wetst. — *καὶ τὰ φύλλα, κ.τ.λ.* This is to be referred to the heathen[11] dwelling outside of the city, as little as xxi. 23 sqq. But against the context also is the explanation of Hengstenb., that, in the present period, the life-forces arising from the Jerusalem, even now in heaven, are to heal the sickness of the heathen, i.e., to effect their conversion; for what is expressed concerning the leaves of the tree of life refers to the same time as that which is said of the fruits. This has been correctly acknowledged by those who have thought of the conversion, in the future world, of heathen to whom in this life the gospel has not been preached,[12] or of the full development of the weak faith of the heathen.[13] But both are contrary to the purpose of the context, which, just because of their faith, makes the heathen[14] share in the glory of the city.

[1] Cf. xxi. 27.
[2] Cf. ii. 7.
[3] Cf. iv. 6, vii. 17.
[4] Cf. ver. 17.
[5] Cf. vii. 17, v. 13.
[6] Andr., Vitr., Beng., Züll., De Wette, Hengstenb., Ebrard, Bleek.
[7] Cf. v. 6. Ewald.
[8] Cf. Ezek. xlvii. 7, 12.
[9] Beng., De Wette, Ew., etc.
[10] ["The perpetual growth of fruits."]
[11] Ewald, Züll.; cf. also De Wette.
[12] Beng.
[13] Ebrard.
[14] xxi. 23 sqq.

By the words καὶ τὰ φύλλα, κ.τ.λ., in an entirely similar way the eternal refreshment and glorification of believing heathen are especially emphasized, as the preceding words ξύλον ζωῆς — τ. καρπὸν αὐτ. indicate in general the blessed satiety of the inhabitants of the new Jerusalem, of whom no special class whatever is mentioned. In connection with this, the expression εἰς θεραπείαν τ. ἐθν. is as little to be pressed, in the sense that a still present sickness of the heathen were presupposed, since it might possibly be inferred from xxi. 4, that the tears which God will wipe away from the blessed are the sign of pains still endured; but as the tears which are wept because of earthly sorrow are wiped away in eternal life, so the healing leaves of the tree of life serve for the healing of the sickness from which the heathen have suffered in their earthly life, but shall suffer no longer in the new Jerusalem. If they were previously hungry and thirsty, now they are also to be satisfied;[1] if they were previously blind, miserable, and without the power of life,[2] now they are to share in the enjoyment of all glory, holiness, and blessedness. — καὶ πᾶν κατάθεμα οὐκ ἔσται ἔτι. Cf. Zech. xiv. 11. After all upon which God's curse rests has reached its own place, and been eternally separated from the blessed communion of saints,[3] nothing of the kind can any longer be found in the city, wherein, now, also,[4] are the throne of God and of the Lamb, and that, too, immediately near, so that all servants of God, all inhabitants of the city, who, as belonging to God, bear his name upon their foreheads,[5] see his face.[6] — αὐτοῦ belongs to the chief subject ὁ θέος — καὶ νύξ, κ.τ.λ. Only by an artificial expedient does Züll. find here "something entirely new," in comparison with what is said at xxi. 23, 25. — καὶ βασιλεύσουσιν, κ.τ.λ. With the richest and, at least, a figurative expression, John concludes his announcement of the future glory of believers, by at the same time emphasizing the eternal duration of that happy state as explicitly as in the description of the judgment upon enemies.[7]

Vv. 6-21. The *Epilogue*, which naturally contains two parts, since it first (vv. 6-17) comprises the revelations which John had received, and then also (vv. 18-21) the prophetical book in which John had written the revelations received for the service of the churches, comes to a close. In both respects this conclusion corresponds to the introduction of the whole (chs. i.-iii.), in which likewise the double purpose enters, viz., that of communicating the prophetical scriptures to the churches, and that of designating the contents of revelation as such from the very beginning.

καὶ εἶπέν μοι, viz., the angel, who spoke at xxi. 9.[8] This is acknowledged also by Ebrard, who, however, finds here not an angelic declaration interposed anew, but a repetition of the account of John, who now once more recalls the angelic declaration previously received. Ebrard decides, logically, that in ver. 8 sqq. there is presented not a repetition of the event actually occurring, xix. 10, but only a repetition of the account of the same.

[1] Cf. ver. 17, vii. 16.
[2] Cf. iii. 17.
[3] xx. 10, 15, xxi. 27.
[4] This is (cf. Jos. vii. 12; Beng.) the inner connection with what follows, which, however, appears to be formally annexed by the καί.
[5] xiv. 1, iii. 12.
[6] Cf. xxi. 3, vii. 15.
[7] x. 10; cf. xx. 14 sq.
[8] De Wette, Bleek, Volkm.

This conception, however, is not only in conflict with the mode of statement in the text, but is also improper for the reason that thereby the return, indispensable to the harmony of the entire Apoc., from the series of visions, iv. 1–xxii. 5, revealing the future[1] to the standpoint of the introductory vision,[2] is cut off. Cf. also ver. 16. — *οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι, κ.τ.λ.* Cf. xxi. 5. The angel looks back to the entire revelation communicated to John. Cf. vv. 7, 18 (*τ. λόγ. τ. πρ. τ. βιβλ. τούτ.*). So also Klief. — *τῶν πνευμάτων τῶν προφητῶν.* "The spirits" of the prophets are here no more than in 1 Cor. xiv. 32, the effects of the Spirit present in the prophets,[3] but are the spirits belonging to the different prophets, which God subjects to himself, and inspires and instructs by his own Spirit. Thus the Lord, who is the God of the spirits of all the prophets, has especially manifested himself now in the spirit of John; this God has communicated to John[4] his true words of revelation by signifying to him, through the ministry of the angel, the things which are to come, in order that he may proclaim them to his servants. — *τοῖς δούλοις αὐτοῦ*, i.e., believers in general, *ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις*, ver. 16.[5] — *καὶ ἰδοὺ, ἔρχομαι ταχύ.* As the Divine authority, so also especially the chief contents of the now completed revelation are again made prominent, — this occurs by the angel speaking directly in the name of the coming Lord himself,[6] — and then the parenetic inference which this affords (*μακάριος, κ.τ.λ.*)[7] is added by the angel. — On ver. 8 sqq., cf. xix. 10. — *ὁ ἀκούων καὶ βλέπων ταῦτα.* The part. pres.[8] marks, without regard to time, the idea of (ecstatic) hearing and seeing of these things, and accordingly the prophetic dignity of John, who just by hearing and seeing all that has been "shown" him for eye and ear, has become the Divinely-appointed interpreter of the Divine mysteries. Thus the pres. particularly shows that the *τάυτα*[9] refers not only to what has been reported, ver. 6 sq., but also to the entire revelation of God. On the other hand, the aor. occurs (*κ. ὅτε ἤκουσα*) where that which is special, ver. 6 sq., is treated. The variations, consequently, which by additions to the mere *ἤκουσα* recur to the first clause of ver. 8,[10] yield an absolutely false interpretation; for John falls down before the angel, because he thinks that in the speech heard (*ὅτε ἤκουσα*), vv. 6, 7 (consider especially ver. 7), he recognizes the Lord himself. — *καὶ τῶν ἀδελφῶν σου τῶν προφητῶν.* That the prophets are here especially emphasized as the brethren of John, distinguished from the rest of believers,[11] is natural, because it is now the intention to assert the prophetical authority of John and his book, which the rest of believers are to receive and keep as a testimony of the Lord. Corresponding also with this, is the fact that the angel immediately imparts the command[12] not to seal[13] the revelations written in this book, but to communicate them to believers. — *ὁ καιρὸς γὰρ ἐγγύς ἐστιν.* Cf. i. 3. The nearer the time is, the more the churches need warning and consolation with respect to what is contained in this revelation.

[1] *ἃ δεῖ γενέσθαι ἐν τάχ.*, ver. 6. Cf. iv. 1.
[2] i. 9–iii. 22.
[3] De Wette.
[4] Cf. i. 1 sqq.
[5] Cf. i. 1.
[6] Cf. ver. 12, xi. 3.
[7] Cf. xiv. 13, xix. 9.
[8] Cf. xx. 10.
[9] Notice the plural, which recurs also in the correl., *τ. δεικν. μοι ταῦτα*, ver. 8.
[10] See Critical Notes.
[11] Cf., on the other hand, xix. 10.
[12] Cf. i. 11, 19.
[13] Cf. x. 4; Dan. viii. 26, xii. 4, 9.

— *ὁ ἀδικῶν, κ.τ.λ.* The practical result afforded by this revelation is expressed, ver. 11, by the angel himself in a parenetic address[1] which, recurring to what the former visions proclaimed, as well concerning the eternal ruin of the godless as also the eternal glory of the righteous, applies it to both classes of men. In connection with this, the summons to those doing wrong, and the filthy (*ὁ ῥυπαρός*)[2] to continue in their godless course, and thus to hasten to sure ruin, is not without a certain irony.[3] [See Note XCVIII., p. 494.] The purpose of ver. 11 is the less to be mistaken, as the allusion to the retributive advent of the Lord not only immediately precedes (*ὁ καιρ. γ. ἐγγύς ἐστιν*, ver. 10), but also is added directly afterwards (ver. 12 sq.), and here the impending righteous retribution is expressly emphasized: *ὁ μισθός μου, κ.τ.λ.* Cf. xi. 18; Isa. xl. 10, lxii. 11. — *ὡς τὸ ἔργον ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ.* Cf. xx. 12. — The words, ver. 12, read like a speech out of Christ's own mouth, those of ver. 13[4] like one of God himself; but, just because of this alternation, it is unnatural to ascribe both declarations to the angel, speaking in the name of Christ and God. On the other hand, the alternation of speakers appears too confused, if Christ himself and God be regarded as actually speaking, particularly since ver. 14 sq. (*τ. ἐντ. αὐτοῦ*) is most easily regarded a parenetic digression of John. Hence the speeches of vv. 12 and 13, at the close of the book, must be conceived of here in the same way as the keynote of the entire speech of God given from the very beginning in the introduction, i. 8. In the ancient prophetic way, John, who shows himself to be a true interpreter of Divine revelation, in two compendious Divine declarations, fixes the fundamental thoughts of this entire prophecy (cf. ver. 20); the very abruptness of these expressions is an indication that Christ and God do not actually enter into the scene as themselves speaking. The speech, ver. 12 sq., thus understood, forms then the transition from the speech of the angel actually present to the parenetic words of John, ver. 14 sq. — *τ. ἐντολ. αὐτοῦ.* Of God,[5] not of Christ.[6] On the reading advocated by Ew. ii., *πλύνοντες, κ.τ.λ.*, see Critical Notes. This reading is deprived of its plausibility by the correct estimate of vv. 12, 13. — *ἵνα ἔσται.* Cf. Winer, p. 271. — *ἡ ἐξουσία αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον τ. ζ.* The purpose of the godly who endeavor, according to the promised reward, to eat of the fruits of the tree of life,[7] shall certainly be attained; hence the beatitude. — *καὶ τοῖς πυλῶσιν, κ.τ.λ.* Cf. xxi. 27. — *ἔξω οἱ κύνες, κ.τ.λ.* The ordinary idea in the declarative sense, expressed by the annexed *δὲ*, appears too feeble; the inner opposition to the beatitude, ver. 14, more readily suggests the conceiving of the words, ver. 15, as a command, so that *ἔξω*, etc., does not mean "*foris* sc. *sunt*" ["without are dogs"], but "*foras* sc. *sunto*" ["let dogs be without"], etc.[8] — *οἱ κύνες.* General designation of moral impurity; cf. *ῥυπαρός*, ver. 11.[9] A special reference to Sodomites[10] does not lie in the context. — *κ. οἱ φαρμακοὶ, κ.τ.λ.* Cf.

[1] According to Klief., an exhortation, added by John, is contained in vv. 11-15.

[2] Cf. xxi. 27: *βδέλυγμα*; Jas. i. 21: *ῥυπαρία.*

[3] Cf. Ezek. iii. 27. Andr., De Wette, Ebrard, Kienlen.

[4] Cf. xxi. 5, 6, i. 8.

[5] Cf. xii. 17, xiv. 12. Züllig, De Wette, Hengstenb.

[6] Grot., Beng., etc.

[7] Ver. 2, ii. 7.

[8] Cf. Matt. v. 13, xiii. 48.

[9] Phil. iii. 2; Matt. vii. 6.

[10] Eichh., who compares Deut. xxiii. 18.

xxi. 8. — Still once more there follows, ver. 18, a concluding certification of the prophet, which in a double respect comprehends the introduction of the whole, since Christ, as the One revealing his own coming, not only maintains that he himself has given this revelation through the angel sent by him,[1] but also expressly emphasizes the determination of the same for the churches.[2] The latter occurs in an address to the churches themselves, *ὑμῖν — ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις*, which is then the more applicable if the words, ver. 16, be regarded not as an actual speech coming from the Lord's mouth, but[3] as spoken in the name of Christ. The reading *ἐπὶ τ. ἐκκλ.*, — i.e., "over," in reference to the churches,[4] not "to" the churches,[5] nor "in[6] the churches," nor with the gen., as Beng. explains,[7] since he refers the *ὑμῖν* as dative to the angels of the churches, but regards the *ἐκκλησίαις*, which he also reads without a preposition, as an ablative — avoids indeed the seeming difficulty that the speech of the Lord is directly applied to the churches, but creates a far greater difficulty with respect to the relation of the *ὑμῖν*, which then can refer only to the prophets in general.[8] But the idea that the Lord had the mystery of his advent proclaimed by all the Christian prophets is here not only impertinent, but is expressly rejected by the words *ἐπεμψα τ. ἄγγελόν μου*, which definitely marks the present revelation to the prophet John; but the application of this to the churches is throughout appropriate. Cf. also the answer of the churches, ver. 17. [See Note XCIX., p. 494.] *ἡ ῥίζα καὶ τὸ γένος Δαυίδ.* What the first expression means figuratively, and according to the O. T. prototype,[9] the second says more properly: the Son.[10] In this passage the interpretation is also to be rejected, according to which the sense is that "in Christ alone the family of David stands and is preserved."[11] [See Note XLV., p. 216.] *ὁ ἀστὴρ ὁ λαμπρὸς ὁ πρωϊνός.* Here Christ himself is called the bright morning-star;[12] for from him issues the light of eternal day.[13]

To the message announced several times from ver. 6, as from the Lord's own mouth, about which the entire revelation revolves, there now follows the answer: Ἔρχου. Thus speak "*the Spirit*," who, on the one hand, qualifies the prophets for announcing the future to the churches, and, on the other hand, also works faith in the churches, and thus inspires them also with hopeful longing for the coming of the Lord,[14] "*and the Bride*," i.e., the assembly of believers who are moved by the Spirit[15] [see Note C., p. 494]; and thus also every individual is to speak who hears the joyful promise of the coming of the Lord (*καὶ ὁ ἀκ., κ.τ.λ.* In connection with the latter summons, John expressly adds (*καὶ ὁ διψῶν*)[16] that the eternal blessings of life, which the coming Lord will distribute, are to be had gratuitously by every one who

[1] Cf. i. 1.
[2] Cf. i. 3 sqq.
[3] Cf. ver. 12 sq.
[4] Züll., Hengstenb. Cf. x. 11.
[5] Luth.
[6] Vulg.
[7] Cf. also Wolf.
[8] Cf. ver. 9. Hengstenb.
[9] Cf. v. 5.
[10] Andr., Ewald, etc. Cf. Virg., *Aen.*, IV. 12: Credo equidem — *genus* esse deorum.
[11] Vitr., etc.
[12] Cf., on the other hand, ii. 28.
[13] Cf. xxi. 23.
[14] Cf. xix. 10, ii. 7, 11.
[15] Cf. xxi. 9.
[16] Cf. xxi. 6; Isa. lv. 1.

desires to receive them.[1] This pertains only to the desire that is authenticated by the fidelity of obedience. The δωρεάν placed with great emphasis at the close, is truly of an evangelical character, and energetically defends the book against the charge of anti-Pauline Judaism.[2]

Vv. 18–21. The close of the book in which the prophet has communicated to the churches the revelation given to him. Instead of the commendation, accompanied by rich promises, of the prophetical book, which stood in the beginning,[3] there appears here likewise a threatening corresponding to its Divine authority against all who corrupt it (ver. 18 sq.). The prophet then once more declares, as a word of the Lord himself, the chief sum of the entire revelation, by, on his part, meeting this promise of the Lord with the believing prayer for its fulfilment (ver. 20), and then concludes with the Christian farewell greeting, corresponding to the address to the churches (i. 4). — The threatening (ver. 18 sq.) has developed from the allusion in Deut. iv. 2,[4] but has been shaped (ἐπιθήσει ὁ θ. ἐπ' αὐτ. τὰς πληγὰς, κ.τ.λ., ver. 18; ἀφελεῖ ὁ θ. τὸ μέρος αὐτ. ἀπὸ τ. ξύλου, κ.τ.λ., ver. 19), according to the standard of the preceding descriptions, — the threatened "plagues" being not only those described in ch. xvi., which indeed in xv. 1, 8, are co-ordinated as the last described in the former visions,[5] — and is marked in its righteousness by the paronomastic mode of expression (ἐάν τις ἐπιθῇ — ἐπιθήσει ὁ θεός ἀφέλῃ — ἀφελεῖ).[6] The threatening is presented in the most formal way, παντὶ τῷ ἀκούοντι τοὺς λόγους, κ.τ.λ., i.e., to every one who, through the reading in the church, hears the prophetic discourses written in the present book.[7] From this personal designation it results, at all events, that the threatening with the curse is not directed against inconsiderate transcribers;[8] but on the other hand, Ew. i. and De Wette improperly press the expression τ. ἀκούοντι, when they refer the threat to the danger that what is received only with the ear in oral communication is easily falsified, and thus a distraction of Christian hope could be produced. Then the threatening must by its injustice create offence.[9] But the ἀκούοντες come into consideration, not as mediators of the literary tradition, but as those who are to appropriate "the contents" of the prophetical book, revealed to them by God, — notice that ἐάν τις ἐπιθῇ ἐπ' αὐτά, is first said, — for their own warning and encouragement, and are to maintain it in its purity, and to act accordingly. These fall under the curse when they arbitrarily falsify the revelation of God that has been given, because they will not approve the righteous ways of God, which are here described,[10] and consequently call down upon themselves the wrathful judgments of God, which impend over unbelievers. — ὁ μαρτυρῶν ταῦτα, Christ. Cf. i. 2, xix. 10. With a word of the coming Lord himself, which contains the very marrow of the entire revealed testimony given to the prophet,[11] he

[1] Cf. i. 3. [2] Cf. Rom. iii. 24. [3] i. 3.

[4] LXX.: οὐ προσθήσετε — καὶ οὐκ ἀφελεῖτε, κ.τ.λ.

[5] On τ. μέρος αὐτ., κ.τ.λ., cf. xxi. 8. Ewald: "Shall withdraw fellowship."

[6] Cf. xi. 18.

[7] Cf. i. 3. Ew., De Wette.

[8] Vitr., Züll., Bleek, etc.

[9] De Wette. Cf. also Luther, *Introduction* of 1522: "Besides, I think that it is entirely too much that he severely commends and threatens with respect to such a book of his own, more than other holy books, as though it were of much more importance."

[10] Cf. xv. 3 sq., xi. 17 sqq.

[11] Cf. Introduction, p. 28.

concludes his book, not, however, without sealing with his Ἀμήν his believing acceptance of the Lord's promise,[1] and expressing his own longing for the Lord's coming, in the sense of ver. 17.

The epistolary closing wish (ver. 21) corresponds to the dedication (i. 4 sqq.) whence also the *πάντων* obtains its limitation. This is expressed incorrectly in the addition *τῶν ἁγίων*, but correctly in the *ὑμῶν*.[2]

Notes by the American Editor.

XCVII. Ver. 1. *ποταμὸν ὕδατος ζωῆς.*

This has often been interpreted as referring to the Holy Spirit (Gerhard, Lightfoot, Calov., Philippi, etc.). Thus Calov.: "By the river of water of life *ἐκπορευόμενον* from the throne of God and of the Lamb, we understand the Holy Spirit, whose 'personal characteristic,' as they say, is *ἐκπόρευσις* (John xv. 26), from the Son, no less than from the Father, the throne of majesty."

XCVIII. Ver. 11. *ὁ ῥυπαρὸς ῥυπανθήτω, κ.τ.λ.*

Alford finds a parallel in our Lord's saying, Matt. xxvi. 45: "'Sleep on now, and take your rest;' also Ezek. xx. 39;" and interprets the irony: "'The time is so short that there is hardly room for change;' the lesson conveyed in its depth being, 'Change while there is time.'"

XCIX. Ver. 16. *ἐπὶ ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις.*

Luthardt: "A congregational book; not a book merely for a few, and for a small circle, is this book of prophecy. And Jesus himself expressly confirms the fact that it is from Him. Who will venture to contradict Him?"

C. Ver. 17. *τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ νύμφη.*

Luthardt: "The Spirit, who lives in the Church, and the Bride, the Church, that lives in the Spirit, say 'Come!' This is all her sighing and longing." Hengstenberg, however, qualifies this: "Not the Spirit who dwells in all believers (Rom. viii. 26), but the Spirit of prophecy (xix. 10); the Spirit of the prophets (xxii. 6), in which John was on the Lord's Day (i. 10, iv. 2), who also speaks through John in ch. xiv. 13, who proclaims the promises in the seven epistles. The Spirit, and John his organ, as the representative of the Bride, proclaim '*Come.*' This 'Come,' spoken in her name by the organ of the Church, is a fact; they speak, and hence there follows the summons to all the individual members of the Church to join in this '*Come.*'"

[1] Cf. v. 14, xix. 4.

[2] Rec., Luth.

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.
11791

BS2344 .M5 1883 v.11
Dusterdieck, Friedrich Hermann Christia
Critical and exegetical handbook to the

11791

BS
2344
M5
1883
v.11

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY AT CLAREMONT
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

23-262-002

11791